



**DELHI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY**

DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Cl. No.

R3:Q.2216

F7

Ac. No.

28591

Date of release for loan

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below.
An overdue charge of 5 Paise will be collected for each day the
book is kept overtime.

THE
PUNJAB ORIENTAL (SANSKRIT)
SERIES

NO. XIV.

THE
Punjab Oriental (Sanskrit) Series
OR
A COLLECTION OF RARE & UNPUBLISHED
**BOOKS RELATING TO ANCIENT
INDIA**

EDITED BY
THE WELL-KNOWN & EMINENT SCHOLARS
OF
INDIA, EUROPE and AMERICA
No. 14.

LAHORE (INDIA)
THE PUNJAB SANSKRIT BOOK DEPOT
1927.

THE PHILOSOPHY
OF
VAISNAVA RELIGION

(with special reference to the Kṛṣṇite and
Gaurāṅgite Cults)

BY
GIRINDRA NARAYAN MALLIK, M.A. B. L.,
Professor of Sanskrit,
Comilla Victoria College.

IN TWO VOLUMES
VOL. I.

PUBLISHED BY
MOTILAL BANARSI DAS,
Punjab Sanskrit Book Depot,
Saidmitha, LAHORE

1927.

PUBLISHED BY
MOTI LAL BANARSI DAS,
Proprietors,
The Punjab Sanskrit Book Depot
SAIDMITHA STREET
LAHORE.

PRINTED BY
DURGA DASS "PRABHAKAR"
Manager,
The Bombay Sanskrit Press,
SAIDMITHA STREET,
LAHORE.

Dedicated to
my spiritual guide
whose exposition of the Bhāgavata
and Charitāmṛta Texts, evincing a spirit
of reconciliation and broadness of views, has simply
charmed the literary public of Bengal, and whose
genial kindness it is that has enabled me to
write something upon a subject so vast
and difficult as the Philosophy of
Vaiṣṇava Religion.

Preface.

In this treatise I have endeavoured to give a faithful exposition of the principles of Vaisnava Philosophy, with special reference to the Bhāgavata Cult and Gourāṅgism, in the lines adapted to the method of western speculative thought. My main basis here is the Śatsandarbha in which the reputed author Jiva Goswāmī has offered to the interested public a thorough critical exposition of the philosophy contained in the whole volume of Bhāgavata texts. For reasons best known to himself the author of the Śatsandarbha, in this the only systematic treatise on the philosophy of Vaisnavism in all its various sects, has not spoken a single word about the concept of Gourāṅga—the nucleus in Bengal Vaisnavism, although the fact is that according to him as well as to all other Vaisnava savants this concept is to be traced to the Bhāg. texts and as such ought to find a place in any philosophic compendium of the Bhāgavata. Whatever the intention might be, this omission seems an anomaly to me; and it may be explained away by saying that, since Gourāṅga is identical with Kṛṣṇa so far as the theory goes, the author is silent on this point simply with a view to avoid an unnecessary bulkiness of his treatise and also because the difference in beatific sports between the two Divinities is sufficiently indicated in his learned commentary—Vaisnava Tosanī—on the tenth Skandha of the Bhāgavata.* The omission, however,

* This inference is based upon the concluding verse of the Satsandarbha—अथ विस्तरशङ्कातो या या व्याख्या न विस्तृता । सा श्रीदशमटिप्यन्यां दृश्या रसमभीष्टुभिः ॥—“Such interpretations as have not been given here for fear of prolixity are to be found, by those that are desirous of attaining rasa, in my commentary on the tenth Skandha (of the Bhagavata)”

has been made good by the excellent treatise Chaitanya Charitāmṛta which I may fittingly describe as the best Theologico-philosophical didactic purport of the Goudīya Vaiṣṇavas and which is regarded as the highest authority because of the clear positive statement in matters relating to the Gourāṅga cult. Nor is the authoritativeness of the Charitāmṛta to be questioned and minimised on the ground that the book is written mostly in Bengali, for the simple reason that the content alone of a thing is to be judged in merits or defects irrespectively of the outer covering. Besides, the work could not but be written in Bengali: for in all countries at all times a religion is best popularised through the medium of a popular dialect or vernacular and not through the literature language. In Europe, for instance, Martin Luther attempted to read Protestantism through the medium of Germany, Wycł protested against the existing abuses of Roman Catholicism through English, and John Hauss preached against Roman Catholicism through the Bohemian dialect. It is needless to say, therefore, that for a detailed account of the Gourāṅga cult I have mainly based upon this Charitāmṛta text. Yet, with all deference to this sacred treasure-trove of the Vaiṣṇavas, and as a protest against the stricture that it shows signs of blind sectarianism in purpose, I am inclined to say that some portions of the treatise, e. g. the part of the seventeenth chapter, Ādi Līlā, that deals with 'the fact of articles necessary for Bhavānī-worship being placed by a brahmin in the house of a fervant devotee to Gourāṅga', and is pervaded by a tone of hostile criticism against the Śākta sect of religion, seem to me an interpolation* inasmuch as they militate against the true spirit and real significance of Vaiṣṇava Philosophy.

To satisfy the curiosity of a class of readers it is indeed

* I have more to say on this point in my next attempt.

thought necessary to give some historical accounts of the two authors and works referred to above. From the Charitāmṛta texts it appears that Jiva Goswāmī, the worthy nephew of the two illustrious Vaiṣṇava savants Rūpa and Sanātana, was contemporaneous with Śrī Gourāṅga and flourished towards the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century A. D. in the three places, viz, Vākalachandradvīpa (Vṇḍāvana), Fateyāvāda and Rāmakeli (N. Bengal).^{*} The name Ṣaṭ-sandarbhā evidently implies that the book is divided into six sandarbhas or sections, viz., Tattva-Sandarbhā, Bhagavat-Sandarbhā, Paramāṭma-Sandarbhā, Kṛṣṇa-Sandarbhā, Bhakti-Sandarbhā and Prīti-Sandarbhā. The exact date of the first publication of this work is not known: and all that we can infer from the implication of the Charitāmṛta texts is that the book was brought to publication not before the year 1533 A. D.—the year in which the manifest līlā of Śrī Gourāṅga was brought to a close.

As regards the other author, it appears from the autobiographical references in the Charitāmṛta that he was born in a village named Jhāmāṭapura in the district of Burdwan in W. Bengal and passed the closing years of his life in Vṇḍāvana. The work was begun in the birth place where the

^{*} The exact date of birth is not known from any internal evidence. What the Viśvakosa says, viz. that he was born in 1523 A. D., is not at all tenable inasmuch as if that is accepted, at the time of Śrī Gourāṅga's sending him away to Vṇḍāvana (some year during the period of 1515-33 A. D..) he would either be unborn, or, if born at all, a mere child—a conclusion which is nothing but an absurdity; cf. Kṛṣṇachaitanya Navadeipe avatari asta cchallisa vatsara prakatavihari || Chowdda Sata Sata Sake janmera prmana—, Chowdda Sata panchanne haila antarddhana ||, Aniya Lila, XII.

original mss. are still now available, and completed in Vṛndāvana in the year 1615 A. D. as is evident from the concluding verse, viz.—

शाके सिन्धुवाग्निवाणेन्दो ज्यैष्ठे वृन्दावनान्तरे ।
सूर्येऽह्निऽसितपञ्चम्यां ग्रन्थोऽयं पूर्णतां गतः ॥

which means that the book was completed in Vṛndāvana on Sunday the fifth day of the dark fortnight in 1537 Śak. corresponding to 1615 A. D.

Besides the *Ṣaṭsandarbha* and the *Charitāmṛta*, various other books have been consulted and referred to, a list of which is given in the Bibliography attached.

For the sake of convenience to readers long quotations from the *Ṣaṭsandarbha* have been given in an Appendix.

Comilla, 1926.

G. N. MALLIK.

Contents.

Benedictory Verse

Introduction.

CHAPTER I.

WHAT DO WE UNDERSTAND BY PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION ?

1. The Hegelian view of coincidence between Religion and Philosophy is stated.

2. True Religion which consists in faith in the Absolute Being implies a relation of distinction and unity between a worshipping subject and the worshipped Object.

3. The twofold revelations, viz, (a) the general one contained in Scriptures, (b) the particular inspiration of individual beings, bridge over the chasm between the subject and the Object.

4. Revelation is utilised by religious faculties as well as by a particular method of experience and practice.

5. The method adapted necessarily implies an end in view.

CHAPTER II.

IS THERE ANY NECESSITY FOR A PHILO- SOPHY OF VAIṢṆAVA RELIGION

Vedas.¹ The Philosophy of Vaisnava Religion is general in

1. Numerous
has being the
same.
conciliation of all the different sects of religion,
Vaisnava System.

is missapprehension about the true theory of
igion prevailing both in India and abroad.

CHAPTER III.

THE FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES COMMON TO THE SYSTEMS OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY—VAIṢṆAVA PHILOSOPHY INCLUDED.

1. The doctrine of Transmigration of soul.
2. The doctrine of Karman.
3. The doctrine about the cause of bondage or transmigration.
4. The doctrine of salvation or emancipation.
5. The doctrine about the origin of the world.

CHAPTER IV.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION IN THE PRESENT TREATISE.

1. The topics are tacitly indicated in the Benedictory Verse:—

(a). Kṛṣṇa is the worshipped Object, (b) relation between this Object and a worshipping subject is that between the Devoted and a devotee, (c) Bhakti is the means to be adopted for the attainment of (d) Prema, the summum bonum.

BOOK I.

CHAPTER I.

PRAMĀṆAS OR SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE.

1. Statement and examination of the different opinions about the sources of knowledge.
2. The maximum number of Pramāṇas or systems of Indian Philosophy is ten.
3. The three sources—Perception, Inference are admitted by ancient Vaiṣṇava philosophers

and the Law-giver, the others being included in these three.

4. *Samvit* as a source of knowledge is included in *Śabda*.

5. Perception as a source of knowledge—not an independent authority and vitiated by reason of many defects—too great distance etc.

6. Inference being based upon Perception is attended with the same defects and open to the same objection; besides, it does not always hold good.

CHAPTER II.

AUTHORITATIVENESS OF THE VEDAS.

1. Inadequacy of the two sources—Perception and Inference—being proved, the only final authority is *Śabda* or the Vedas.

2. Fundamental conceptions about the sole independent authoritativeness of the Vedas: the same is viewed also by the great sage *Vādarāyaṇa* in his *Brahma Sūtras* and the *Māgavata* and also by many authors of *Smṛti* texts.

3. Denotation of the term *Veda*—the four Vedas proper, *R̥g*, *Yajuh*, *Sāman* and *Atharvan*, as well as the *Itihāsas* and *Purāṇas*.

4. The *Purāṇas* serve merely as an interpreter of the meaning of the four Vedas proper, same view is held in the *Mahābhārata* and in the *Manu Smṛti*.

5. The *Purāṇas* are a supplement to the four Vedas, as indicated by the very name *Purāṇa*.

6. Relation of *Bhedābheda* between the *Purāṇas* and the four Vedas.

7. Numerous *Śruti* texts corroborate the fact of the *Purāṇas* being the Vedas; statements in several *Purāṇas* prove the same.

8 Superiority of the Purāṇas over the four Vedas is clearly indicated by way of fundamental conceptions; the same fact is corroborated by a critical examination of the true meaning of Religion, as well as by the real nature of the Summumbonum.

9. Threefold classification of the Purāṇas-Sāttvika,* Rājāsika, of which the Sāttvika class of the sage Vyāsa is the best.



CHAPTER III.

SUPREME AUTHORITATIVENESS OF THE BHĀGAVATA.

1. Different statements about Brahman in different Sāttvika Purāṇas; a reconciliation thereof is possible by reference to the Brahmasūtras of the same author Vyāsa.

2. But the Sūtras themselves are interpreted differently by different commentators, hence a reconciliation is necessary.

3. The only reconciliation is effected by the Bhāgavata Purāṇa belonging to the Sāttvika class.

4. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa is the best and most natural interpreter of the Brahman-Sūtras the authorship being one and the same; it is the unfold of the meaning underlying all the various revealed texts, the Itihāsas and all other Purāṇas; it is the supreme Bhāṣya on the sacred Gāyatrī.

5. A thorough exposition of the first verse of the Bhāgavata as the unfold of the true meaning of the Brahma Sūtra and of the Gāyatrī.

CHAPTER IV.

IMPORTANCE, POPULARITY AND CONTENTS OF THE BHĀGAVATA.

1. Supreme authoritativeness of the Bhāgavata is corrob

* In spelling I have used the two letters v and w indiscriminately in some cases, and hope to be excused.

borated by the fact of Truth revealed to Vyāsa in his spiritual meditation.

2. Revelation as the authority in religion according to western systems.

3. The Bhāgavata Cult is indirectly accepted by the great Śāṅkarāchāryya and directly by other commentators.

4. Extensive popularity of the Bhāgavata.

5. Other reasons for the supremacy of the Bhāgavata.

6. The Bhāgavata is the best pramāṇa or source of knowledge in all matters, preeminently in the matter of religion.

7. Contents of the Bhāgavata very briefly indicated.

BOOK II.

CHAPTER I.

✓ PROBLEM OF THE ABSOLUTE.

1. Faith in the Absolute is the starting point of all true religion.

2. Starting faith is intuitive and not based upon Scriptures, for in the latter case there would creep out a paralogism in Pure Reason.

3. Inadequacy of intuition as a basis of certitude in religion, which however depends upon certain latent characteristics.

4. The latent characteristics are made explicit if the intuitive faith be directed in consonance with the Scriptures, rather, with the highest Scripture—the Bhāgavata.

5. The verse of the Bhāgavata which explicitly states the definite character of the concept of the Absolute Reality.

CHAPTER II.

THE CONCEPT OF ADVAYA JNĀNA TATTWA.

1. The principle of the Absolute as Advaya Jñāna Tattwa is stated in the first line of the verse.

2. Five concepts are involved in this main concept, viz. Tattwa, Jñāna, Advaya, Advaya Tattwa and Advaya Jñāna.

3. The concept of Advaya implies in the first place a स्वयंसिद्ध or Self-existent thing; secondly, that there is no other thing of the same class or of a different class, which is self-existent at the same time (स्वजातीयविजातीयभेदवर्जित), and thirdly an absence of difference between the thing-in-itself and its body as well as between the different parts of the body (स्वगतभेदवर्जित).

4. Scriptural texts on the point that the Absolute is not a formless Substance but an embodied Substratum in which inhere endless auspicious qualities. The body consists of Existence, Knowledge and Bliss.

5. Scriptures on the point that there is absence of Swa-gatabheda.

6. Jñāna is explained by Jīva Goswāmi as चिद्वक्त्ररूपम् and Advaya Jñāna means selfluminous consciousness; Jñāna further implies one possessing consciousness.

7. Advaya Jñāna necessarily involves an element of bliss, which fact is also shown by the use of the word Tattwa in the verse.

8. Presence of the attributes necessarily implies that the Absolute has got potencies, which intrinsically are Sandhinī, Samvit and Hlādinī.

9. Potencies are potential and kinetic Nirviśeṣa and Saviśeṣa states of one and the same Ultimate Reality, Saviśeṣa being the highest stage.

10. Relation between the threefold Śakti; Pre-eminence of Bliss; Bliss necessarily implies associates, dwelling place etc of the Absolute.

Chapter III.

THE CONCEPT OF BHAGAVĀN

1. Threefold manifestation of the Absolute Advaya

Jñāna-Tattva is indicated in the second line of the verse, viz, Brahman, Paramātmā and Bhagavān, the last being the highest aspect.

2. Viṣṇu Purāṇa texts on the concept of Bhagavān.

3. The Absolute Bhagavan possesses a form and body similar to those of a human being, as evidenced by the Bhāgavāta and the Gopāla Tāṇī texts, and as strengthened by the true implication of Christianity and Islāmism.

4. The Absolute is limited and unlimited simultaneously, the limitation is self-determined.

5. Three-fold classification of the potencies into (a) Swarūpa or Parā (b) Taṭasthā or Jīva and (c) Vahiraṅgā or Māyā.

6. The concept of Bhagavān implies an eternal display of the Swarūpa Śaktis-Sandhinī, Samvit and Hlādinī, which constitute the very self of the Absolute.

7. Six fold lordliness; a graceful charm underlying the same is the differentia of the concept of Bhagavān.

8. Gradation of the three Swarūpa Śaktis. An elaborate exposition of the Śruti text रसो वैसः रसं हेवायं लब्ध्वानन्दी भवति । Dwelling place of Bhagavān is something supersensuous, quite distinct from the heart of beings.

9. A critical examination of the various Scriptural texts on the concept of Bhagavān.

10. Recapitulation of the characteristics of the concept of Bhagavān.

Chapter IV.

THE CONCEPT OF BRAHMAN.

1. In the derivative sense the concept of Brahman is identical with that of Bhagavān; hence to avoid confusion Vaiṣṇava Philosophy applies the term Para Brahman to Bhagavān and Brahman to the concept of the Absolute as explicated by the school of Śaṅkara.

2. Śaṅkara's theory of Brahman is briefly indicated. This Brahman is the bodily lustre or a partial manifestation of Bhagavān.

3. Brahman is the Nirviśeṣa state of Bhagavān-the saviśeṣa state.

4. The distinction between the two concepts is not absolute, but one of degree, and is inseparably connected with the difference in religious realisation. Realisation as Bhagavān is superior to that as Brahman.

5. The distinction is upheld by the Bhāgavata and other texts.

6. A critical examination of the Upaniṣad text "ब्रह्म पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठा" and of the Gītā text ब्रह्मणो हि प्रतिष्ठाहम्

7. The same relation of difference between the two concepts is also viewed by the Charitāmṛta and the Brahma Saṁhitā.

Chapter V.

THE CONCEPT OF PARAMĀTMĀ.

1. Being the partial manifest in the saviśeṣa state of Bhagavan, Paramātmā is the direct displayer of the Vahiraṅgā or Māyā Śakti, the Immanent Regulator of all beings, and is preeminently called the Kṣetrajña Ātmā.

2. Paramātmā is Purusa while Bhagavān is Purusottama as the Mahopanīṣad Śruti says. Resemblance of this view to the Hegelian view of Personality.

3. Threefold manifestation of Paramātmā Puruṣa, viz, (i) Mahā Viṣṇu as Kāraṇārvaśāyī Saṅkarsaṇa, (ii) Garbhoda-kaśāyī Purusa and (iii) Kṣīrodaśāyī Purusa.

4. Relation between the three concepts of Bhagavān, Paramātmā and Brahman is explained by way of reference to Śruti texts and the Vedānta Sūtras. The relation is one of gradation in the hierarchy of manifestations of one and the same Ultimate Reality.

BOOK III.

Chapter I.

THE CONCEPT OF KṚṢṆA AS THE ABSOLUTE.

1. An exposition of the first verse of the Bhāgavata so as to show how the whole theory of the Kṛṣṇa Cult is contained in it.

2. A positive, emphatic and unambiguous statement about Kṛṣṇa's absoluteness in the Bhāgavata Mahāvākya-
“एतच्चांशकलाः पुंसः कृष्णस्तु भगवान् स्वयम्”

3. A critical examination of the Mahāvākya shows that Kṛṣṇa is not simply an Avatāra but the Ultimate Reality or Bhagavān Himself in the absolute sense of the term. The same fact is conclusively established by the main canon relating to the exegesis and apologetic of Hinduism.

4. The derivative meaning of the name of Kṛṣṇa conclusively shows that He is the Being in Whom all the three Swarūpa Śaktis have eternally attained the highest development. The same fact is corroborated by the Vṛhat Goutamīya, the Gopāla Tāpanī and other Śruti Texts.

5. Absence of Swagata Bheda in Kṛṣṇa is illustrated.

6. Reasons why Kṛṣṇa is most appropriately described as the Absolute of all Absolutes. The guiding force of Mādhuryya or graceful charm is present in Him revelling in beatific sports in the supersensuous Heaven-trio, and attains the fullest display in His sports in Goloka or Vṛndāvana-which stage is the highest object of worship in the Bhaktimārga.

7. The fact that in Kṛṣṇa the Absolute all contradictions are conquered is illustrated in the Bhāgavata texts.

8. The Gopāla Tāpanī describes Him as having the form and dress of a Gopa, with complexion like that of a surcharged cloud, ever young, with eyes like full-bloomed lotuses,

wearing a cloth yellow like lightning, and a Vanamālā. Metaphysical interpretation of the several epithets used here.

9. The associates and dwelling place of Kṛṣṇa. Deification of the same. Mataphysical interpretation of the term Vasudeva, Devakī, Nanda and Yaśodā.

10. Conclusive evidences of the Gītā texts to show that Kṛṣṇa is the Absolute as described above.

11. Kṛṣṇa as the Absolute is evidenced by various Upanisad and Vedic texts. The attribute of Mādhuryya which is the differentia of Kṛṣṇaism is aptly illustrated in the Bhagavata texts.

Chapter II.

THE PRINCIPLE OF RĀDHĀ.

1. The Principle of Rādhā contributes to the all-surpassing excellence of the Bhakti Cult.

2. The concept of Mahā Lakṣmī explained in relation to that of Bhagavān.

3. The twofold aspect of the endless attributes of Bhagavān-(i) Mahā Lakṣmī or Antaraṅgā Mahā Śakti (ii) Vahiraṅgā Śakti.

4. Difference between the triad of Swarūpa Śaktis and the triad of Sattwa, Rajas and Tamas. Meaning of विशुद्ध सत्त्व or Pure Chit.

5. The associates of Kṛṣṇa are the divinities of the three Saktis and the relation between Kṛṣṇa and His Associates is one of Achintya Bhedābheda.

6. Rādhā is Mahā Lakṣmī. The ultimate causality of creation etc. of the entire universe lies in Rādhā. The same relation of Achintya Bhedābheda exists between Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā.

7. Meaning of the term Gopī. The Gopīs are the Kāya-vyūhas of Rādhā as evidenced by the Brahmasaṃhitā and the Charitāmṛta.

8. A brief review of the diverse manifestations of devotional love towards Kṛṣṇa Rādhā represents the highest stage in the hierarchy thereof.

9. A brief analysis of the ecstatic devotional feeling called Mahābhāva which constitutes the differentia of the concept of Rādhā the Ideal Devotee. Reference to the principle of Rādhā in the R̥g Veda.

10. The Cult of Rādhā Kṛṣṇa admitted by the Bhāgavata and other texts.

Chapter III.

MEANING OF LĪLĀ

1. The word Līlā best rendered into English as 'Sport' occurs in the Vedānta Sūtra "लोकवत्तु लीलाकैवल्यम्" which deals with the theory of creation.

2. A criticism of the theory of creation according to the Objective Idealism of Hegel.

3. The most tenable theory of creation, as is indicated in the above sūtra, is that it is a mere sport flowing spontaneously from the Bliss attribute alone of Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa.

4. But this sport does not flow from Kṛṣṇa as Kṛṣṇa but from His partial aspect, and in it the Bliss lies hidden under the Mayā Śakti.

5. The only Līlā of Kṛṣṇa as Kṛṣṇa is the beatific sport in which the best part is played by the divine conjugal relationship which Rādhā bears to Kṛṣṇa.

6. Eternity of Līlā. Twofold aspects of Līlā, Prakata or Manifest and Aprakata or Non-manifest. Relation between the two.

7. Two-fold aspect of non-manifest Līlā-(i) Mantropāsana-mayī (ii) Svārasikī, meaning of the two. A reconciliation between the two is indicated by way of reference to Bhāgavata texts, and is possible only because Kṛṣṇa is the Absolute in whom all contradictions are conquered by the supreme lordship. The latter fact is illustrated in various sports mentioned in the Bhāgavata.

Chapter IV.

JĪVA OR INDIVIDUAL SOUL.

1. The reason why Jīva is called the *Tatasthah Śakti* of Bhagavān.

2. The intrinsic nature of a Jīvā is negatively and affirmatively stated-a Jīva is eternal and permanent ever retaining its own identity; not an aggregate of conscious states as the materialistic view states, but an entity of which consciousness is the attribute; Bliss also is its attribute; selfluminous, having the power of pervading; truly called *Aham* or *Ego*; not one but many; of an atomic size-the smallest of the small pure; *Ksetrajñā*; not liable to any change; not addicted to the effects of *Māyā*, having its nature not concealed; ever in the habit of resorting to Bhagavān-the Highest Resort of all.

3. The view is supported by Śruti texts and the Vedānta Sūtras.

4. Classification of Jivas into (1) Eternally released (ii) Averse to Bhagavān from beginningless time.

Chapter V.

THE DOCTRINE OF MĀYĀ.

1. *Māyā* is the *Vahiraṅgā Śakti* of Bhagavan. The *Tatastha Lakṣaṇa* and the *Swarūpa Lakṣaṇa* of *Māyā*.

2. Two main aspects-(i) *Nimitta* or *Jīvā Māyā* and (ii) *Upādāna Māyā*, corresponding to the Aristotelian classification of causality into (a) Efficient and (b) Material. The four concepts of काल दैव; कर्म and स्वभाव constitute the elements of the *Nimitta* aspect, while those of द्रव्य, प्राण, आत्मा (Empirical Ego)विकार and देह, of the *Upādāna* aspect.

3. Twofold function or emanation of *Jīva Māyā-Vidyā* and *Avidyā*. *Vidyā* is a doorway to right knowledge. *Avidyā* has two functions-*Āvarṇātmikā* and *Vikṣepātmikā*.

4. Various names of *Upādāna Māyā*. The operation of

Māyā is explained by way of analogy to the operation involved in solar phenomena.

5. Śaṅkara's theory of Māyā as an Illusion is briefly stated with a preliminary observation. Māyā according to that theory is something undefinable-neither being nor non-being.

6. Untenability of this theory is sufficiently proved. The theory is full of inconsistencies and almost amounts to atheism, and hence should be rejected. Some merit of the doctrine is pointed out.

7. The principle of Māyā as the potency of Bhagavān is strengthened by means of scriptural texts-Ṛg Veda and others.

Chapter VI

✓ RELATION BETWEEN THE ABSOLUTE (BHAGAVĀN) AND INDIVIDUAL SOUL (JĪVA)

1. The true relation between the Absolute and an individual soul is one of Achintya-bhedābheda and is tenable the more because it tallies with the view of other religions prevailing amongst civilised nations, is revealed to our conscience, and is in agreement with our reasoning.

2. The same is referred to in scriptural texts.

3. A critical examination of Vedānta Sūtras I, 2-12, II 1-22, II 3-42...45, to show that Bhedābheda is the real relation.

4. The relation of non-identity is further corroborated by various other scriptural texts-Śvetā. Up, Muṇḍaka, etc.

5. The relation is akin to one between a master and his servant as definitely established in the system of Vaiṣṇava Philosophy and as corroborated by scriptural texts.

6. A critical examination and refutation of the Avachhedā Vāda or the Appropriation-Theory with results.—

(a, Brahman would become the sufferer of endless miseries;

(b) It is the internal organ and not Brahman appropriated which ought, according to that theory, be regarded as soul:

(c) Brahman, really अखण्ड and अखण्ड, would become split up into parts:

(d). there would appear a constant changeability of Brahman ;

(e) the concept of Release according to that view would be untenable;

(f). Brahman would be reduced to an unreality ;

(g). the analogy shown is false.

7. A critical examination and refutation of the Prati-vimba Vāda or the Reflection Theory with results-

(a) Reflection is not possible of Brahman which according to that view is devoid of attributes;

(b). the all-pervasiveness of Brahman stands in the way of tenability of the theory ;

(c). the analogies shown are proved to be materially false;

(d). Reflection itself is false according to that theory ;

(e). the comparison drawn in substantiating the theory is proved absurd.

Chapter VII.

THE PROBLEM OF CREATION.

1. A critical estimate of the two doctrines of Vivarta and Parināma, the latter alone being proved tenable.

2. By Parināma Vāda the world is real and the reality is relative or conditional, i. e. the world though real is transient and perishable.

3. A critical examination of the Śruti Text “अपाम सं-
मम् अमृता अभुमन्नयं ह वै चातुर्मास्ययाजिनः सुरुतं भवति

4. The world, though the effect of the Māyā Śakti of the Eternal Being, is yet non-eternal owing to the inconceivable power of the Lord.

5. Vijñāna Bhikṣu on the reality of the world. Other fruti texts prove the same view. True implication of the text तस्मादिदं जगदशेषमसत्स्वरूपम् ". Śāṅkara himself indirectly admits the view, as appears from a critical examination of his definition of Māyā.

6. Reconciliation between the two apparently conflicting texts- 'सदेव सौम्य इदमग्र आसीत् and असदेव इदमग्र आसीत्

7. A brief critical review of some of the important western theories about the world, the highest development reaching in the Objective Idealism of Hegel whereby the reality of the world is maintained.

8. The doctrine of the world's reality plays not an insignificant part in the sphere of Vaiṣṇava Religion, as is evidenced by Bhāgavata texts. True nature of the duties of worldly beings, which are compatible with the real significance of true religion, is critically examined.

9. Creation, though directly proceeding from the unconscious Pradhāna, proceeds therefrom only because of the ईक्षण or conception, i. e. consciousness of the Absolute Idea. The same view is directly held by Christianity and indirectly by the Sāṃkhya system.

10. The two constituent elements of the actual or concrete world, Spirit and Matter.

11. The theory of Śabda Brahman in its bearing upon Creation. The same idea occurs in the Western theory of Logos and in the Neo-Platonic philosophy.

12. The doctrine of the world's reality affords a most satisfactory and reasonable explanation of the world itself. The reason why creative processes do proceed at all. A thorough exposition of the sūtra लोकवत्तु लीलैकैवल्यम्

Chapter VIII.

THE CULT OF GOURĀṅGA.

1. An introductory historical background to, and general remarks about, the Gourāṅga Cult.

2. Popular misconceptions about the concept of Gourāṅga; a criticism thereof with an observation on a similar misconception about the divinity of Christ. The true view stated.

3. Gourāṅga is Advaya Jñāna Tattwa Bhagavān Himself as evidenced by the Charitāmṛta Text-“न चैतन्यात् कृष्णात् जगति परतत्त्वं परमिह”. Identity between the two concepts of Kṛṣṇa and Gourāṅga as viewed by the Charitāmṛta.

4. The differentia of the concept of Bhagavān-(a) the eternally concrete potency for granting beatific joy to all alike even to plants and creepers; (b) the charming gracefulness ever manifest in all acts. Presence of the first attribute in Kṛṣṇa is conclusively proved by texts like the Laghu Bhāgavatāmṛta, the Bhāgavata, the Śatapatha Brahmana, and the Manu Smṛti; psychological interpretation of the same fact. Presence of the same in Gourāṅga is proved by Charitāmṛta texts and explained psychologically.

5. Presence of the second attribute alike in Kṛṣṇa and Gourāṅga, but preeminently in the latter, as evidenced by various texts.

6. Relation between the Kṛṣṇa Cult and the Gourāṅga Cult-identity in theory but difference so far as the beatific sports are concerned.

7. Philosophic necessity, possibility and actuality of the manifest sports of Kṛṣṇa.

8. The same of Gourāṅga sports: Non-fulfilment of three-fold desire during the manifest sports in Vṛndāvana; To satisfy the same constitutes the inner reason for the Gourāṅga Cult; The outer reason consists in the object of teaching the

phenomenal beings of the Kali age the principles of Bhakti by way of Himself playing the role of the Ideal Devotee Rādhā, and thereby putting an end to the religious anarchy prevailing at the time.

9. Gourāṅga-sports supplement Kṛṣṇa-sports, and the two are eternally flowing in current. Charitāmṛta texts on the point.

10. A critical exposition of the Bhāgavata and other texts which support the theory of Gourāṅga as the Advaya Jñāna Tattwa.

11. Removal of the modern misconception that Gourāṅgism is irrespective of Kṛṣṇaism. Combination of the two concepts of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā in the concept of Gourāṅga.

12. The concept of Gourāṅga is involved in the first verse of the Bhāgavata.

13. Superexcellence of the Gourāṅga Cult consists in the fact that besides all the characteristics of the concept of Kṛṣṇa something more is present in the concept of Gourāṅga.

Book IV

✓ THE CULT OF BHAKTI AND THE SUMMUM BONUM.

Chapter I.

GENERAL FEATURES OF THE CONCEPT OF BHAKTI.

1. Preliminary observations on the concept of Bhakti. Bhakti is the means which counteracts the Jīva's averseness to, and restores the natural function of contiguity with, Bhagavān.

2. Bhakti is the only means for the attainment of the

blissful knowledge of Bhagavān, and derivatively it means. Upāsana or Dhyāna. The same is viewed by lots of scriptural texts.

3. Bhakti is the highest duty (परोधर्मः as the Bhāgavata says). Meaning of Dharma. The differentia of the concept of Bhakti consists in the two attributes अहैतुकी and अग्रनिहता। Scriptural texts and the Kantian theory on this point.

4. In the highest stage Bhakti as the instrumentality for subjugating Bhagavān consists of the essence of the Hladini potency combined with the Samvit. A critical examination of this fact.

5. The full concept of Bhakti implies the harmonious combination of bliss, knowledge and act, preeminence being attached to bliss. An elaborate exposition of this doctrine by way of reference to scriptural texts.

6 The nine stages in meditation-Śraddhā, Sādhusanga Bhajanakriyā, Anarthanivṛtti, Niṣṭhā, Ruchi, Āśakti, Bhāva and Prema, the last being the highest stage.

7 Definition of the Ahaitukī or Uttamā Bhakti sufficiently explained.

Chapter II.

✓ RELATION BETWEEN THE CULT OF BHAKTI AND OTHER CULTS.

1. The various modes of religious realisation are classified into (a) the Karma-Mārga, (b) the Jñāna-Mārga, (c) the Yoga-Mārga, (d) the Bhakti-Mārga proper.

2. The Karma Mārga is based upon the Karma Kānda of the Vedas which are in this respect called a परोक्षवाद (i. e. the real meaning of the acts or ceremonial rites enjoined in the Vedas lies hidden).

3. Acquisition of Brahma-jñāna is one underlying motive of the performance of such acts, and resignation of such acts to Bhagavān is one means for attaining Release.

4. But this means is only a preparatory i. e. indirect and remote one, and hence its inferiority to the Bhakti-Mārga. The latter fact is supported by Gītā texts.

5. The Jñāna-Mārga consists in realisation of Bhagavān in the Nirviśeṣa state, i. e. of Brahma. Two classes of followers-(a) those that meditate upon Brahman irrespectively of an implicit faith in Bhagavān, (b) those that do so with the starting faith in Bhagavān. Sub-classes of these two classes.

6. Superiority of the second class is established by common sense and scriptural texts. Hence the superiority of the Bhakti Cult as evidenced by lots of scriptural texts. ✓

7. Meaning of Yoga. The Swarūpa-lakṣaṇa is 'suppression of the modifications of the thinking principle,' the tataṣṭha lakṣaṇa-'the tranquil state of the thinking principle which is called Asamprajñāta Samādhi and which is followed by Kaivalya."

8. Three main stages of Yoga. In the Yoga Mārga Bhagavān is realised in His Saviseṣa state as Paramātmā and hence it is one kind of Bhakti.

9. Relation between the three cults of Jñāna, Yoga and Bhakti-the all surpassing supremacy of the Bhakti Cult over the others as shown by the Gītā and other texts; the next higher stage is Yoga; the lowest is the Jñāna Mārga. Bhakti is the sole basis of the two others, if these latter are to yield any realisation at all.

10. The gradation is explained further. Relation between the four Mārgas-Karma, Jñāna Yoga, and Bhakti-is briefly indicated.

Chapter III.

✓ EXCELLENCE OF THE BHAKTI CULT, AND
JĪVA'S PRONENESS THERETO.

ly qualities, is capable of uplifting one to the highest heaven and contributing to the beatific sports of Bhagavān.

2. It embraces all irrespective of their outward rites. True significance of the Smṛti texts and meaning of सदाचार. Defiled practices are not altogether ignored.

3. It is accessible to all irrespective of caste, creed etc.

4. It is alike welcome to the literate and illiterate.

5. It is equally intended for beings desirous of Mukti and those that have already attained it.

6. The formal rite of worship as prescribed in the Bhakti Cult is not restricted to the dedication of particular varieties of things and acts.

7. The state of being initiated into the Bhakti Cult is irrespective of attachment or averseness to worldly objects.

8. Bhakti is compatible with whatever motive a devotee might have in view.

9. It is the best safe-guard against all kinds of evils and difficulties besetting a man.

10. It has the unique power of counteracting sinful acts.

11. Two plausible theories on the question of Jivas proneness to Bhakti, viz (a) the first initiation depends upon an individual being's contact with saintly characters, (b) the grace of Bhagavān is the primary cause. Reconciliation of these two theories consists in the conclusion that the first initiation is due to the goodness of Bhakti itself.

12. Classification of saints. Characteristics of a true saint of the Bhāgavata type.

13. The question of 'necessity of spiritual guide' is discussed and established by scriptural texts. How far a spiritual guide is to be honoured and worshipped.

CHAPTER IV.

✓ TWO STAGES OF BHAKTI-(A) INJUNCTORY, (B) RĀGĀNUGĀ OR THE FLOWING CURRENT OF DEVOTION.

1. Injunctory Bhakti consists in practice under the sole guidance of the injunctions laid down in Scriptures. The principal elements are-(a) Śaraṇāpatti, (b) Worshipping and honouring the spiritual guide (c) Śravaṇa (hearing of scriptural texts), Kīrtana (citation of the sweet names of Bhagavān in a quorum, attended with music), Pādasevam, Archana, Van-dana, Dāśya, Ātmanivedana. A rational interpretation of these concepts.

2. Injunctory Bhakti alone does not lead to the attainment of the summum Bonum which can be directly attained by Rāgānugā.

3. The word Rāga in the wide sense means the natural flow of desire for, or the spontaneous inclination towards, the enjoyment by a self or subject of the contact of its own not-self or object.

4. Hence the various Divinities of the Bliss attributes of Bhagavān are naturally, spontaneously and unconditionally inclined towards the Infinite Rasa, and the latter though one and the same appears differently through the medium of the Divinities just in the same way as the difference in the six sensuous rasas, sweet etc, is caused by different substances imbibing one and the same source—rainwater.

5. Fourfold classification of the different supersensuous emotional feelings—Dāśya, Sakhya, Vātsalya and Mādhuryya; Śānta Bhakti is directed towards Paramātmā. Distinctive features of these five.

6. The common feature of the five is Rāga which in this technical sense means excessive concentration naturally directed towards Bhagavān. Bhakti based upon this is Rāgātmikā

and Rāgānugā is Sadhana Bhakti proceeding on a similar line.

7. Superiority of Rāgānugā over Injunctory Bhakti. A critical examination of the Mīmāṃsā Sūtra चोदनालक्षणोऽर्थो धर्मः and of the Bhāg. text श्रुतिस्मृती ममैवाज्ञे यस्ते उल्लङ्घ्य वर्तते । आज्ञाच्छेदी मम द्वेषो मद्भक्तोऽपि न वैष्णवः ॥ in their bearing upon the concept of Rāgānugā.

8. The true spirit of Rāgānugā is an excessive fervency and buoyancy in devotional spirit, which is so very important that even though displayed from an insincere or sinister motive is amply rewarded by the grace of Bhagavān. Illustration of this fact

9. True meaning and implication of the conjugal demonstrations in the devotional love between Kṛṣṇa and the Gopīs. The final reason for such demonstrations is to be found in the Ved Sūtra लोकावत्तु लीलाकैवल्यम् ।

CHAPTER V.

SUMMUMBONUM-DIFFERENT THEORIES ABOUT IT.

1. In the Vaisnava System Prema Bhakti is the summumbonum. Its content is fuller and richer than, and reconciles within itself, all other concepts of summumbonum.

2. In the systems eastern and western three things are generally described as the summumbonum-(a) Extinction of miseries, (b) attainment of pleasure, (c) self realisation. The first being negative in character is excluded; the second also is excluded owing to the paradox that the impulse towards pleasure, if too predominant, defeats its own aim. The third is the true summum-bonum.

3. A critical review of the important western theories viz, those of Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, the Epicureans, the

Mediæval Philosophers, Lock, Mill, Bain and Sidgwick, Hegel and his school.

4. The self realisation theory of Professor Green is briefly stated. Though he has hit upon the right point, yet he is unable to explain the full import of selfrealisation and thereby involves himself in an inextricable circular reasoning.

5. A critical review of some of the Indian theories viz those of Chārvāka, Buddhism, Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Mīmāṃsā and Yoga systems.

CHAPTER VI.

THE HIGHEST GOOD OR SUMMUMBONUM IN THE VAIṢṆAVA SYSTEM.

1. According to the school of Śaṅkara Mukti is the summumbonum which is described by them as consisting of three elements viz (a) absolute merge of soul in Brahman, (b) absence of the consciousness of any feeling whatsoever, (c) extinction of miseries. Untenability of this proved by means of scriptural texts.

2. According to Vaisnava Philosophy, by Mukti is meant that intuition or sight of the Highest Lord, which is the natural state of the individual soul, and which follows on the destruction of the influence of the Māyā Śakti by the only means of Bhakti.

3. Such intuition may take place in two ways-(a) the Highest Lord may reveal Himself to the contemplative mind alone (अन्तःसाक्षात्कार), (b) He may present Himself to the mind as well as to the different sense organs बहिःसाक्षात्कार. In either case a peculiar state of composure of the mentality is indispensably necessary.

4. The minds not attaining this state are classified into two-(a) those that are averse to the Supreme Lord, (b) those

that are hostile to Him. Each of these admits of two subcategories.

5. This meaning of Mukti is supported by the Śruti text—
म वा एव पश्यन् एव.....कामचारी भवति ।

6. Mukti is of five kinds—(a) Sālokya, (b) Sārṣṭi, (c) Sārūpya (d) Sānīpya, (e) Sāyujya. Distinctive features of the same.

7. Common characteristics of Mukti in all the five stages are (a) intuition of the Lord, (b) regaining of the soul's natural bliss, (c) extinction of miseries. The first constitutes the Mukti proper, while the others follow as a concomitant consequence.

8. But for the highest bliss or love to follow as a consequence, the vision of the Lord must be the clearest of all, and that is possible only when the eye of Bhakti is tinged with the collyrium of Prema.

9. At this stage Mukti is called Prema Bhakti and this Prema Bhakti is the summumbonum in Vaiṣṇava Religion.

10. Relation between Mukti and Bhakti is one of Bhedābheda.

CHAPTER VII.

DEFINITE CHARACTER AND CONTENT OF PREMA

BHAKTI-THE SUMMUMBONUM.

1. Derivatively Prema Bhakti implies an act which is definitely designated as the act of Sevā or servitude to Bhagvān.. This is also the true and natural meaning of 'Self-Realisation', not clearly understood by Professor Green.

2. The concept of Prema Bhakti—accurately speaking—of Prīti Bhakti is the fullest and richest of all other concepts of summumbonum, and yet reconciles them within itself.

3. All-surpassing superiority of this Prīti Bhakti is established by scriptural texts.

4. A Psychological analysis of the meaning of the word **प्रीति** in **प्रीतिभक्ति** ascertains that the devotional love towards Kṛṣṇa is similar to the love between a mother and a child, between husband and wife, etc, only so far as the altruistic character of the emotional feeling is concerned.

5. Prīti Bhakti is defined as that love which subjugates even Bhagavān; and though it is the summumbonum of phenomenal beings, it occupies the lowest stage in the gradation of love between Kṛṣṇa and the Divinities of His Bliss-attributes.

6. A short account of the hierarchy of super-springs of action from the lowest called Prīti Bhakti to the highest called Mahābhāva.

7. A full discussion of the controversial point "Is the devotional worship of Lord Gourāṅga to be regarded only as the means to the summumbonum-Prema, Bhakti, or the summumbonum itself?"

Concluding Chapter.

PLACE OF MORALITY IN THE SYSTEM OF VAIṢṆAVA PHILOSOPHY.

1. Close relation between religion and morality briefly indicated.

2. Religion as the basis of, and a guarantee for, morality according to all the Hindu systems of thought—preeminently according to the Vaiṣṇava system.

3. Moral qualities and moral precepts as laid down in the Charitāmṛta and other texts.

4. A short review of the cardinal quality of 'kindness to Jīvas', and of many corollary virtues e. g. gift-making, frugality etc.

5. Duties on the basis of personal relationship, eg. duties to parents, children etc.

6. Veracity and control of the passions.

7. The highest conception of morality according to the Bhāgavata Cult-love and service to the whole creation. A criticism of the Positivist's doctrine of 'Love and service to humanity'.

8 A foreshadow of the concrete realisation of the fact that Vaisṇava Religion in its main principle is capable of becoming the Universal Religion.

CONCLUDING VERSE.

BENEDICTORY VERSE.

यस्य ब्रह्मेति संज्ञां कचिदपि निगमे याति चिन्मात्रसत्ता-
प्यंशो यस्यांशकैः स्वैर्विभवति वश्यन्नेव मायां पुमांश्च ।
एकं यस्यैव रूपं विलसति परमव्योम्नि नारायणाख्यं
स श्रीकृष्णो विद्यतां स्वयमिह भगवान् प्रेम तत्पादभाजाम् ॥
(षट्सन्दर्भान्तर्गततत्त्वसन्दर्भे श्रीजीवगोस्वामी ।)

“ May that Absolute Being Śrī Kṛṣṇa, with the sole instrumentality of His eternal compassion, grant to His devotees Prema (the fifth and highest object of human pursuit)—the Being whose existence as pure Idea or Knowledge is styled Brahman in some of the Śruti Texts, whose partial aspect the Puruṣa by way of subduing Māyā is ever positing His supremacy in his own aspect, and whose preeminent aspect Nārāyaṇa is ever manifesting Himself in the region (supersensuous) called Paravyoma. ”.

(Tattwasandarbhā)

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

What do we understand by Philosophy of Religion?

"The object of Religion", says Hegel, "as of Philosophy is the eternal truth in its very objectivity,—God and nothing but God,—and the explication of God. Philosophy is not a wisdom of the world, but cognition of the non-worldly; not a cognition of the external mass of empirical existence and life, but cognition of what is eternal, what is God and what flows from His nature, for this nature must reveal and develop itself. Hence Philosophy explicates itself only when it explicates Religion.....Thus Religion and Philosophy coincide: in fact, philosophy is itself a divine service, is a Religion; for it is the same renunciation of subjective fancies and opinions, and is engaged with God alone" (Wallace's Logic of Hegel, P. 24). From these lines it is quite evident that a Philosophy of Religion is indeed possible whatever objections might be raised by advocates of the theory of Relativity of Human Knowledge. What, then, is the meaning of Philosophy of Religion?

The primary task of a Philosophy of Religion is to ascertain and exhibit the nature of Religion taken as a whole; and in so doing the Science or Philosophy which treats of it as a whole must obviously be most comprehensive, for this follows from the very nature of Religion. Now what is Religion? As distinguished from Fetish worship and the like, Religion in the true sense of the term implies a faith in and devotion to the Absolute Being. Religion, in other words, is a relation between a worshipping subject—an individual soul, and a worshipped object—the Absolute

Lord. It implies further an element of distinction as well as one of unity between the subject and the object. Were there no distinction, there would be no religion. Were there no unity but only distinction, were the Absolute Being—the worshipped object and an individual being—the subject worshipping—absolutely separate from and indifferent to each other,—religion must be impossible. Religion thus supposes two main factors which are different and yet related—so far distinct and so far akin. Our views of Religion must depend on our views of these two main factors. Religion involves something more. The Absolute Being does not act on man by the direct manifestation of His Absolute Essence, nor does man know Him by immediate vision. Take away the written word i.e. the Scriptures, or the general revelation of the Absolute, take away again the special revelation i. e. the results of the realisation by many worshipping subjects of the same Absolute, and an impassable chasm will separate man from the Absolute Being, and all religion will at once be destroyed. The direct revelation of the Absolute as laid down in Scriptures, as well as the revelation through particular inspiration—these will bridge over the chasm and consequently religion is every where found existing in some form or the other.

Again, even revelation would be useless if man had not the faculties to apprehend it and to avail himself of it by way of following a particular method of experience. The happy relation between the worshipped object and the worshipping subject can only be realised through religious faculties and processes which can be analysed and which have laws of exercise and evolution that can be traced. Finally, the exercise of such faculties to apprehend, as well as the undergoing of these particular processes, would be meaningless and visionary, so to say, if these acts were not done

with some object in mind. It is the end which satisfactorily accounts for the means to be performed. The poet says—
 “प्रयोजनमनुद्दिश्य न मन्दोऽपि प्रवर्त्तते” i. e. no energising of whatever kind is found to proceed without a definite object in view.

Thus ultimately we come to this, viz :—that Religion requires us to treat (1) of the object of religion (the Absolute), (2) of the subject of Religion (man or any other being), (3) of the media and processes of religion, and (4) of the end to be attained by following the processes. These are the topics that are generally found to be included in the function of a philosophy of religion.

CHAPTER II.

Is there any necessity for a Philosophy of Vaisnava Religion?

Philosophy of Religion as indicated in the previous chapter, though it itself is special in relation to Philosophy of which it is only one department, may yet be regarded as general in so far as it treats of religion taken as a whole. This general character is compatible with the universal character of the meaning of Philosophy; and as such, to write a treatise on the philosophy of Religion seems natural and consistent. But if there is a special Religion which is very significant and important and is the pivot round which a good number of special religious centre, then the philosophy of such a sectarian religion would, I am afraid, not detract from the general character of the philosophy of Religion, and hence can not be regarded as an irrelevant task. And for the same reason it should not be urged against this that such a treatment is tainted with the fault of a biased attempt. Even if for argument's sake such a biased motive be admitted, we can fairly assert thereto that no one, however

liberal-viewed and open-minded he might profess to be, is altogether free from some sort of bias. Principal Caird, for example, who is regarded as a great philosophical writer of note in Europe, begins to write an introduction to the philosophy of Religion and finishes with a chapter in which he cannot refrain himself from the temptation of showering an eulogy upon Christianity which is but a special kind of Religion. Thus there is nothing unnatural and objectionable in our humble attempt at writing a treatise on the philosophy of Vaisnava Religion however sectarian it might be regarded by critics.

The question then arises—Is there any necessity for the philosophy of Vaisnava Religion?

In the first place Vaisnava Religion or the Cult of Devotion is concerned with faith in, and devotional worship of, Visnu. Notwithstanding the minute differences—more or less in details, all the different scriptural texts of the Hindus agree in asserting that the conception of Divinity culminates in the concept of this Visnu inasmuch as Visnu represents in the highest degree all that is majestic and sublime, all that is blissful; and this is signified also by the derivative meaning of the term which from the root **विष्** to pervade means the All-pervading One.¹ In preference, therefore, to the other religious sects prevailing in India, Vaisnava Religion alone is to be truly called Religion inasmuch as it is concerned with the All-pervading Being—the Absolute. Besides, as will be made clear by and by, the concept of Visnu or Kṛṣṇa is so very rich in character and content that while retaining its own uniqueness it includes the various concepts of the Object of worship in the other Religious sects prevailing here and abroad, and consequently, if the ultimate Reality according to these latter sects be called the Absolute, the worshipped Object and Loving Deity of the Vaisnavas might appropriately be styled the Absolute of all Absolutes. The main tenets and

1. See Appendix.

didactic precepts, again, as laid down in Vaiṣṇava Theology are highly lofty in nature far outriding in many respects those in any other religion. It appears therefore that Vaiṣṇava Religion reconciles within itself and yet transcends all the different sects of religion that prevail amongst the civilised nations of the world; and hence a scientific treatment of its theory in a most comprehensive way is helpful to the study of all religions, and, if thoroughly mastered and practised, prepares the way for making men pious and religious.

Secondly, the theory of Vaiṣṇava Religion, as will be shown in the following pages, is based upon the Scriptural texts and the Vedānta Sūtras which have also given birth to many more sects prevailing in India. This common storehouse of the principles of Hindu Sectarian religions has been interpreted differently by different commentators, but of all the interpretations the one advanced by Vaiṣṇava Philosophers is the most natural and faithful in-as-much as it never goes beyond the texts and the Sūtras. Yet, strange to say, the authors and critics abroad in Europe and America have been remaining quite in the dark about this meaning for a very long time though they seem to know something of the other interpretations and theories. Writers like Caird, Hoffding and others, for example, while going to give an account of the Vedānta System, refer only to Śaṅkara's interpretation and that too in a way which testifies to their superficial knowledge only even of this defective commentary. Those few again who have ever cared to know anything of the Bhāgavata and other allied texts have not been able to understand a bit the philosophy of the beatific sports of Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa and thus have dared to make a most harmful statement, viz. that the Bhāgavata Texts are full of allegories. To remove such sheer ignorance and gross misapprehension of facts affords a sufficient reason why an exposition of the Philosophy

of Vaisnava Religion should be attempted.

Thirdly, in India also a similar unhappy—perhaps more pernicious—result has occurred owing to a miserable ignorance of the true theory and a consequent vitiated exposition of the principles of Vaisnava Religion by a class of irresponsible teachers or Gurus. These so-called preachings and malpractices have unfortunately given rise to a few sects of pseudo-Vaisnavism which may be justly described as the ghostly shadow of the very laudable Goudīya Vaisnava sects, and these latter, including the Sahajīyā, the Āl, the Vāul, the Kāṭābhajā and other sects, have been spreading their unhealthy influence all around, and thereby, far from making men religious, are fast throwing them into a state of utter ruin and irreligion. To check the progress of such debauchery in religion and such gross immorality affords no less an important reason why an attempt should be made for a faithful exposition of the principles of Vaisnava Religion.

Lastly, in the present day, many a scholar of repute in the sphere of Indian Philosophy and a good number of irresponsible Bhāgavata preachers, while giving an exposition of the Bhakti Cult, are proceeding in such a haphazard way and introducing many foreign ideas in such a blending manner that many earnest students of Vaisnava Philosophy are unfortunately inclined to accept as the views of ancient Vaisnava Savants what is really far from them.

At such a critical time and for the above reasons it seems not unfair that a short treatise dealing with the true Philosophy of Vaisnava Religion should be undertaken. And ours is an humble attempt towards that direction, and it lies with the goodness of kind readers to judge how far it has succeeded.

To enable our readers to follow what we are going to say, we think it necessary to give an idea, in as few words as prac-

licable, of the several fundamental doctrines that are commonly accepted in almost all the systems of Hindu Philosophy. The next chapter therefore deals with that topic.

CHAPTER III.

The Dogmas or Fundamental doctrines common to nearly all the systems of Indian Philosophy—the Vaisnava system included :—

1. The doctrine of Transmigration of Soul.

All the six systems of Indian Philosophy maintain that the soul (excepting those that are eternally released) has everlasting existence and that it is exempt from liability to extinction. They all hold that the soul is again and again invested with a corporeal frame, that every individual passes after death into a series of new existences in heaven or hell or in the bodies of men, animals or plants on earth, where it is rewarded or punished for all deeds committed in a former life. The soul may soar so high as to become a divinity or it may descend so low as to appear as a tree.

The great merit of this doctrine lies in the fact that it gives a most satisfactory explanation of the misfortune or prosperity which bring seemingly caused by no action done in this life, can not be accounted for in any other way, that it satisfies the requirement of justice in the moral government of the world and at the same time inculcates a valuable ethical principle which makes every man the architect of his own fate.

(2) The doctrine of Karma.

All the six systems maintain that every event of the present life is the result of an action done in a past life, that the same holds true of each preceding existence ad infinitum. The subsequent effectiveness of acts good or bad, com-

monly called "Adṛṣṭa or Unseen" but often also simply **karman**, is believed to regulate not only the life of the individual but also the formation and development of the world and all effects wrought therein by which souls are in any way affected. There is thus no room for independent divine rule by the side of Karman which governs everything with iron necessity. Hence even the theistic systems that acknowledge God assign to Him the function of guiding the world and the life of creatures in strict accordance with the law of retribution which even He can not violate.

(3) The doctrine about the cause of bondage or transmigration.

According to all the systems Ignorance is the chief cause of bondage; and ignorance means 'that the soul though distinct from the mind, the senses and the body, identifies itself with them'. The Vaiṣṇava system specifically states that from beginning-less time the soul or Jīva deviates away from its natural and proper function of contiguity to Bhagavān, and for this act of transgression the soul comes under the influence of the Māyā Śakti of Bhagavān, and thereby identifies itself with the mind, the senses and the body which are but the effects of the same Māyā Śakti. From this identification it receives pleasure or pain. Hence there arises in the soul a desire for pleasure and an aversion from pain. And by reason of such desires and aversions it engages in various good and bad acts from which accrue to it merit and demerit. Then to receive requital it has to pass to heaven or hell, and repeatedly to be born and to die.

Again the systems declare that good works no less than bad works contribute to bondage, for works of whatever character entail inevitable consequences which necessitate rebirth (cf अवश्यमेव भोक्तव्यं कृतं कर्म शुभाशुभम्) And it is not to be questioned that the fruit of good works being hap-

piness, they cannot lead to bondage; for goodworks, for the enjoyment of their desert—the so called happiness (सुखसंज्ञकम्) compel the soul, until their fruition is consummated, to abide in the body of a deity, a man or some other superior being. Besides, the happiness resulting from good works is only transitory and itself is misery. (cf तद् यथैह कर्मजितो लोकः क्षीयते एवमेवामूत्र पुण्यजितो लोकः क्षीयते—Chhā VIII, 1, 6.)

Good works again are distinguished primarily into incumbent or obligatory, and voluntary. Incumbent acts are those that must always be done under all circumstances and are such that their non-performance leads to a transgression, e.g. the daily muttering of prayers and the like. Voluntary acts are those that are done with a desire for the attainment of some fruit e. g. elysium etc. the performance of which is not obligatory, and hence are such that their non-performance does not lead to a transgression. Such acts are the performance of sacrificial rites as enjoined in the scriptures. The incumbent acts are further divided into constant (daily muttering of prayers etc.) and occasional (bathing in the Ganges on the occasion of an eclipse, or the like). It is to be noted here that, according to the Vaisṇava system, of these three classes of acts the constant or incumbent ones which relate to the devotional worship of the Absolute Being Bhagavān do not operate for bondage but prepare the way for the attainment of the Summum bonum.

It is further to be noted in this connection that works in general are of three descriptions viz. accumulated (सञ्चित) current (क्रियमाण), and fructescent (प्रारब्ध). Accumulated works are such among those done in former lives as have not yet borne fruit; by the acquisition of right apprehension (according to the Vaisṇava system, by the grace of Bhakti which yields right apprehension as a concomitant

consequence), these are burnt or rendered ineffectual. Current works are those which are done in the present life; these have no effect on the possessor of right apprehension. Fructescent works are such as were done in former lives and gave origin to the body now inhabited, determining its duration and everything appertaining to the present state of existence. These works cannot be made void by right apprehension; and it is to receive the requital thereof that the man of right apprehension has to remain for some time in the body and to experience diverse joys and griefs. Subsequently to the enjoyment thereof—the enjoyment which is not attended with a further desire for attaining effects, these works however are rendered void. According to the Vaisnava System specifically, these fructescent acts also are rendered void immediately by the high potency of Bhakti.

✓ 4. The Doctrine of Salvation or Emancipation.

The systems all declare that release from transmigration and from all that it entails, in other words, emancipation, can be achieved only by acquiring Right Apprehension, which again in the Vaisnava System is based entirely upon Bhakti. Right Apprehension consists in the recognition by the soul of itself as distinct from the mind, the senses, the body and all else.

5. The Doctrine about the origin of the world.

That the world originated from a material cause is likewise a doctrine of all the Systems. That out of which anything is made or from which anything proceeds is called its material cause. Clay is such a cause of a jar, and gold of golden ornaments. As every effect must have a material cause, the systems deem the ultimate material cause of all effects to be without a beginning. Of course the world is from time to time resolved into elements and then evolved again, the gross world being sublimated on the occurrence .

of this resolution into its subtle material cause, but as these resolutions or mutations have always been taking place, the stream of the world has been flowing on from eternity.

Chapter IV.

Topics for discussion in the present treatise :

We have already said that in a treatise dealing with the Philosophy of Religion the Anuvandhas or topics for discussion are generally four in number ; and for convenience to readers these should be enumerated here, viz-(a) Viṣaya or subject matter, which is the same as the object of Religion, (b) Sambandha or relation between the subject matter and the being that practises religion, (c) Abhidheya or the means to be adopted for realising the subject matter, and (d) Prayojana or the highest end or object of desire to be attained.

In the benedictory verse it has been tacitly indicated that Śrī Kṛṣṇa is the subject matter of the present treatise, in other words, Kṛṣṇa is that which this treatise is going to establish as the Absolute Being, and which therefore is the Object of Vaiṣṇava Religion ; that the relation between Kṛṣṇa-the Object and the being or subject that follows Vaiṣṇava Religion is that between the worshipped object and a worshipping subject ; (that Bhakti or devotional cult in all the various stages is the Abhidheya or means ; and finally that Premānanda (strictly speaking Sevā or servitude to the Lord Kṛṣṇa) is the Summanubhūtam or the highest end to be attained in consequence of realising the Highest person Kṛṣṇa.) To discuss and elucidate these four points is the sole object of this our humble attempt. But in all matters, no less in the sphere of religion, nothing can be—nothing should be—stated, which is not based upon or corroborated by Pramāṇas. It is meet therefore to ascertain and exhibit the nature of Pramāṇa in the very beginning.

BOOK I.

Chapter I.

Pramāṇas or sources of True Knowledge :

In the Vātsāyana Bhāṣya on the Nyāya Sūtras Pramāṇa is thus defined—“प्रमाता येनार्थं प्रमिष्येति तदेव प्रमाणम्” “that whereby a seeker after right knowledge attains the same is called a Pramāṇa”. This definition tallies also with its etymological meaning viz प्रमीयते अनेन इति प्रमाणम्—“It is called Pramāṇa because by it one arrives at Right Apprehension”. Briefly speaking, therefore, Pramāṇa is प्रमाकरणम् or the instrumental cause of right knowledge (Pramāṇa). On this point however, viz, that Pramāṇa is indispensably necessary for the attainment of right knowledge all philosophers agree. Still there is a good deal of difference as to the number of such Pramāṇas or sources of knowledge, and this appears from the following verses :—

प्रत्यक्षमेकं चाद्वैताः कणादसुगतौ पुनः ।
अनुमानश्च तच्चापि सांख्याः शब्दश्च ते अपि ॥
न्यायैरुद्देशितोऽप्येवमुपमानश्च केचन ।
अर्थापत्त्या सहैतानि चत्वार्यर्थाहुः प्रभाकराः ॥
अभावप्रत्यूहानि भट्टा वेदान्तिनस्तथा ।
सम्भवैतिह्ययुक्तानि तानि पौराणिका जगुः ॥

Followers of Chārvāka admit only one source of knowledge, viz. Perception. Followers of the Vaiśeṣika and Buddhistic systems admit two viz perception and Inference. The Sāṃkhya and Yoga systems three viz Perception, Inference and Śabda; but from their treatment it appears that they admit, besides, a fourth Pramāṇa viz Āra (Vijñāna). Holders of the Nyāya View admit four viz Perception, Inference, Śabda and Comparison (Upamā). Of

the Mīmāṃsists, those belonging to the school of Pravākara add Arthāpatti (Supposition) to the above four, while those of the Kumārila school enumerate six in all viz Perception Inference, Śabda, Comparison, Arthāpatti and Anupalabdhi. Some Vedāntists also, e. g., the followers of the school of Śaṅkara, recognise these six as we come to know from the Vedānta Paribhāṣā and other allied treatises. Most of the Purāṇas enumerate eight viz those six and Sambhava and Aithiya. Over and above these we find reference to another source viz Cheṣṭā चेष्टा in the Tantra System. It thus appears that the maximum number of Pramāṇas as stated in the Hindu Scriptures is ten.

But on a careful consideration it would appear that those ten Pramāṇas can be reduced into three only viz Perception, Inference and Śabda, for the remaining others can be shown to be identified with one or the other of these three; e.g., Comparison, Arthāpatti, and Sambhava have the main character of Inference, while Anupalabdhi, Aithiya (ऐतिह्य) and Cheṣṭā can be brought under Perception, and Ārsa may be included in Śabda. That Pramāṇas are these three in number is admitted by Śrī Madhwāchāryya, and is also the view of Manu as we come to know from the text—प्रत्यक्षज्ञानुमानञ्च शास्त्रञ्च विविधागमम् । त्रयं सुविदितं कार्यं धर्मशुद्धिमभीप्सता ॥ (Chapter XII, 105).¹ Of these again, the two sources Per-

1. Besides these three sources of Knowledge we find another viz संवित (Samvit) referred to in the Bhagavata text—यत्र मे सदसद्वरूपे प्रतिषिद्धे स्वसंविदा । अविद्ययात्मनि कृते इति तद्-ब्रह्मदर्शनम् ॥ (1,3- 33). This Samvit is also recognised as an authority in the Garga Samhita. It means knowledge or self-revelation acquired by the hearing of, and contemplation and deep meditation over, the scriptural texts, and perhaps is the same as is referred to by the con-

ception and Inference, it must be admitted, are not found to hold good in all cases. Being performed by phenomenal beings these two processes are necessarily vitiated by the four defects viz error, inadvertance, proneness to deceive others, and incapacity of the different sense organs—the defects that generally associate themselves with wordly men. Hence they cannot invariably hold true, and it is not safe therefore to accept them as authorities specially in the sphere of religion. Yet they may be regarded as such only when they follow some sort of Śabda or Revelation. To take concrete instances :—(Pratyakṣa or Direct Perception) A juggler makes a show of some magical head in such a skilful way that one of the spectators with whose senses the

mentator Govinda Raja in his interpretation of the expression हृदयेनाभ्यनुज्ञातः in Manu's definition of Dharma—the first verse of the second chapter viz विद्वद्भिः संवितः सद्भिर्नित्यमद्वेष्टरागिभिः । हृदयेनाभ्यनुज्ञातो यो धर्मस्तं निषेवत ॥ In his classification of Pramāṇas as we find in the Satsandarbhā, Jīva Goswāmī however does not refer to this Samvit Pramāṇa and the reason is obvious. The scriptural texts are regarded as the direct revelation of the Absolute Being. Taken as a whole they might be regarded as revelation or rather self-revelation (i. e. revelation of the Highest Self) in the most generic sense of the term. But for the purpose of an individual being's attaining religious realisation, this self-revelation must be transfused into, and permanently impressed upon, the individual mind, and thereby individualised, so to say, by the limitation of a finite self. Thus if Samvit means self-revelation, it is but one aspect of the generic self-revelation—the scriptural texts. Hence there is no inconsistency in including this Samvit Pramāṇa within the Śabda or Scriptural texts, and thereby recognising three and not four sources of knowledge.

thing comes in direct contact clearly perceives it, and by way of recognition ascertains it to be no other than the head of his friend that died some time ago. He is thus overwhelmed with grief, when suddenly some body whose words he always accepts as true removes his error by saying 'This head is something illusory, and not a real thing'; the spectator thus abiding by his words rids himself of all his sorrow and his perception is consequently proved a false one. If, again, on another day the same juggler shows a real head, the spectator would not be inclined to accept it as true unless and until some reliable person directs him to that effect. Thus we see that the admissibility or not of Perception in the present case depends entirely upon the words of some trustworthy personage. In other words, Perception as a source of knowledge cannot be regarded as an independent authority; the only authoritativeness it has is a relative one based upon that of Śabda or Revelation.

Besides, Perception is vitiated and falsified by reason of many defects viz (1) too great distance, (2) too much nearness, (3) affectation of the sense organs and organs of action, (4) restlessness and distraction of the mind, (5) too smallness of the thing to be perceived, (6) intervention of something else with regard to the thing in question, (7) over powering by something else, (8) mixture with a similar thing and (9) non-production. To take examples—a bird flying too high above in the atmosphere cannot be perceived; so also is the collyrium in one's own eyes, so very near to him; owing to defects of the eyesight, ears etc., things cannot be perceived; a man overpowered with passions cannot perceive even a near object in broad day light: atoms—the smallest thing can never be perceived; a thing screened by the wall cannot be perceived; stars and planets cannot be seen in the day time owing to the overpowering light of the sun; a drop of water fallen and

mixed with a big reservoir cannot be perceived ; cards cannot be perceived in a quantity of milk which has not yet been transformed into (but may be transformed) the cards.
अतिदूरात् सामीप्यादिन्द्रियघातान्मनोऽनवस्थानात् । सौदम्याद्व्यवधानादिभिमवात् समानाभिहाराच्च ॥ Sāṃkhya-Kārikā, 7).

We have thus no hesitation to say that philosophers recognising Perception as the only source of knowledge are always the butt end of ridicule just in the same way as Chārvāka was retorted to by some body saying “**चावर्वाक तव चावर्वाकीं जारतो वीक्ष्य गर्भिणीम् । प्रत्यक्षमात्रविश्वास घनश्वासं किमुज्झसि ॥**” “ O Chārvāka, O Ye believer in Perception alone, why are you sobbling thus in anger, and remorse, seeing your wife become pregnant from co-habitation with a paramour’.

In the case of inference also the same untenability would appear. Now what is an Inference? It is a process for arriving at a knowledge on the basis of a Vyāptijñāna. The latter therefore is indispensably necessary for an Inference; it is the same as ‘natural connection’. Smoke is technically called Vyāpya (pervaded) and fire Vyāpaka (pervader). This natural connection or Vyāptijñāna is to be understood in the sense “wherever there is smoke, there is fire”, but not in the sense “wherever there is fire, there is smoke”, for fire can exist even without smoke, as is well said in Vāchaspatiniśra’s Nyāya Tātparyya commentary—“**धूमादीनां वह्न्यादिसम्बन्धः स्वाभाविकः ननु वह्न्यादीनां धूमादिभिः, ते हि विनापि धूमादिरूपलभ्यन्ते**” ।

The judgment thus involved is called Vyāptijñāna, and on the basis of this judgment the knowledge of fire which we arrive at is called an Inferential Knowledge. The Anumāna or Hindu Syllogism can be briefly stated thus:—wherever there is smoke there is fire ; this mountain is smoky, therefore this mountain is fiery. But, accurately speaking,

there are five numbers in every Hindu Syllogism, viz Prati-
jñā, Hetu, Udāharana, Upanaya and Nigamana. (1) Prati-
jñā is defined as “साध्यवस्तया पक्षवचनं प्रतिज्ञा”, that is to say,

statement of the Sādhya (e. g. fire which is going to be
established) as being associated with the Pakṣa (e. g.
'mountain' which is that in which the fire inheres) is called

Prati-
jñā. (2) Hetu is defined as “लिङ्ग प्रतिपादकं वचनं पञ्चम्यन्तम्”;

लिङ्ग is the sign or medium through which the existence
of fire is inferred; hence Hetu in the present case is expres-
sed as धूमवत्त्वात् 'because of the smokeness'. (3) Instance is

व्याप्तिप्रतिपादकं वचनम् or a universal proposition stating
the Vyāpti, e.g., whatever is smoky is fiery, as the kitchen

hearth (4) Upanaya is व्याप्तिविशिष्टलिङ्ग प्रतिपादकं वचनम् e.g. तथा

चायम् this mountain is smoky. (5) Nigamana is हेतुसाध्यतया पक्ष-

प्रतिपादकं वचनम् e. g. तस्मात् तथा—Hence the mountain is fiery.

According to Hindu Logicians, a Syllogism is the most
strengthened if it consists of these five members. Still
instances are not rare in which an inference becomes unten-
able and falsified. From the existence of smoke we cannot
invariably conclude about the existence of fire. In the
mountain where fire has just been extinguished by heavy
showers smoke is visible for some time in greater quantities
without the existence of fire. In the rainy season again some
mountains are found to be smoky though fire does not
exist at all. Besides, inferential knowledge which is regar-
ded as the root of all our developed knowledge in worldly
affairs is a very complicated process, and as such it is
not possible to carry on this process in a high degree

unless and until our mental power is sufficiently developed, and it is not at all possible to grow in the case of an infant or one of immature age and intellect.

Chapter II.

AUTHORITATIVENESS OF THE VEDAS.

It thus appears that the two Pramāṇas, Perception and Inference, cannot be regarded as independent instrumentalities for the attainment of right knowledge simply because they cannot be relied upon invariably in all cases.¹ The only reliable authority or source of right knowledge therefore is Śabda i.e. the Vedas. And why? Because the Vedas being the direct revelation of the Absolute Being (ब्रह्मणो निःश्वसितमेतद् यद् ऋग्वेदो यजुर्वेदः सामवेद अथर्वाङ्गिरसः etc. Vih. II, 4, 10.)² are eternally existent handed down to us through

1. It is to be distinctly noted here that in the Vaisṇava System Inference is not altogether rejected as a Pramāṇa. All that is emphasised here is that Inference is not a Pramāṇa if it is independent of Scriptures, but if an inference is based upon Scriptures it is surely to be regarded as an authority, for the mere fact of the authoritativeness of Scriptures without any inferential process would yield nothing whatsoever; cf—

श्रुतिसाहाय्यरहितमनुमानं न कुत्रचित् ।
 निश्चयात् साधयेदर्थं प्रमाणान्तरमेव च ॥
 श्रुतिस्मृतिसहायं यत् प्रमाणान्तरमुत्तमम् ।
 प्रमाणपदवीं गच्छन्नात्र कार्य्या विचारणा ॥
 पूर्वोत्तरविरोधेन कोऽत्तार्थोऽभिमतो भवेत् ।
 इत्याद्यमूहनं तर्कः शुक्लतर्कस्तु वर्जयेत् ॥

(Kurma purana texts cited in the Madhwa Bhasya, p. 9.)

2. The implication of the word निःश्वसित here is to be care-

tradition from time immemorial, because the Vedas are the eternal fountainhead of all knowledge whatsoever, and consist of words and imports that are far above wordly things.

To establish the final authoritativeness of the Vedas on a sound basis we must look at first to the fundamental conceptions regarding them taken as a whole. Now what are the Vedas? They are styled the Śabda Brahman which again is nothing but a partial aspect of Brahman and is eternal. Like Brahman the uncaused cause of all beings, Śabda Brahman is the original eternal fountainhead of all words and ideas. Brahman, again, is also described as Ākāśa in the Śruti Texts. (cf. को द्वेवान्यात् कः प्राण्यात् यदेष आकाश आनन्दो न स्यात्—Chhāndogya). Śabda Brahman therefore is similarly styled Ākāśa. And apart from the derivative meaning, the word 'Ākāśa' generally means something similar to what the Western Science calls Ether.³ According to the Scientific theory, again, the infinite Ether in its vibrations is regarded as the source of all sounds and words. Besides, there is also the Logos theory of the Greeks developed later in Hebrew Thought and appearing in the twofold aspects of

fully noted. To say that the Scriptures came out of the exhalation of Brahman is simply a childish non-sense. The only meaning possible is that the Scriptures stand to Brahman in the same relation as exhalation is to a living being. In other words, the Scriptures are so very important and valuable that they may be regarded as if they were constituting the very life and essence of Brahman. All that is necessary therefore for the attainment of the realisation of Brahman in a clearly defined way is to be found only in the Scriptures. This is the same thing as to say that the Scriptures are the highest authority.

3. See appendix.

eternal Word and eternal Reason. Thus in agreement with the combined implications of the Ether Theory and the Logos Theory, the Śabda Brahman or the Vedas taken collectively and generically is appropriately styled the eternal fountainhead of all concepts and words. The Vedas, or, strictly speaking, the generic Veda, being thus identified with the eternal Word, what the Hindus call the four Vedas is to be understood in the sense of different manifestations of the same Śabda Brahman according to time and space. The ✓ Purāṇas also similarly manifest what is already the eternal word. Though thus manifestations according to time and space, the four Vedas and the Purāṇas are yet to be regarded as eternal and above the limitations of time and space just in the same way as Bhagavān the most primeval and eternal Being, manifesting Himself differently at different times and in different spaces as Nārāyaṇa and the other incarnations, ever retains His own Eternity undisturbed. Such being the fundamental conception about the Vedas, there can be no gainsaying the fact that the Vedas are (and ought always to be) regarded as the highest authority in all matters. Again, both the east and the west regard perception and inference as two sources of knowledge; and these are nothing but words and ideas subject to the limitations of time and space. If, therefore, limited words and ideas are regarded as sources of knowledge, there can be no doubt that the eternal word, subject to no limitations, and the source of all conceivable and inconceivable words and ideas, must be regarded as an authority par excellence. The authoritativeness of the Vedas, in other words, is absolute and independent, while that of the two other sources—Perception and inference—is only a relative and dependent one.

This independent sole authoritativeness of the Vedas has been fully recognised by the great sage Bādarāyaṇa in his Brahman sūtra and also by many authors of Smṛti texts. Thus from the Sūtra तर्कप्रतिष्ठानादप्यन्यथानुमेयमिति चेदेवमप्यविमोक्षप्रसङ्गः । (II, I, 11) we know that a theory which rests exclusively on arguments derived from human reasoning may at some time or place be disestablished by arguments devised by people more skilful in reasoning, and that again by others more skilful, and so on. In other words, owing to the unlimited diversity as to the nature of intellect in the beings that carry on argumentation, the varieties of argumentation are necessarily numberless and no one can positively assert that his is the best and highest argumentation and that reasoning can go no further. This ill-foundedness of human reasoning is moreover evident from the facts that the arguments put forward by the ablest intellectual giants like Buddha, Ulukya, Akṣapāda, Kṣapan-ka, Kapila, Patañjali and others do not tally with one another, nay, they are often times contradictory and no one can definitely assert itself in preference to others. The conclusion from all this, as summed up by the ablest commentators on the Sūtras like Śaṅkara, Rāmāṇja, Madhvāchāryya and Vidyābhūṣaṇa is that with regard to supersensuous matters Scripture alone is authoritative and that reasoning is to be applied only to the support of Scripture. In agreement with this, the great expounder of the Dharmaśāstras—Manu also says—‘ He who supports the teaching of Ṛṣis and the doctrines as to sacred duty with arguments not conflicting with the Veda, he alone truly knows sacred duty’.

(Manu XII, 106)

Similarly, on Sūtra I, 1, 3 शास्त्रयोनित्वात् all the foremost commentators agree that Brahman the Absolute, Being

being raised above all contact with the senses, is not an object of perception or of the other means of proof, but to be known through Scriptures alone and by Scriptures we are to understand the four vedas, the Bhārata, the Pancharātra and other allied treatises. ¹

This view about the authoritativeness of the Vedas we also find in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa where the great sage Vyāsa says that the Veda alone is the best eye for men, gods and other beings to see the Absolute Being in His intrinsic nature—in body as well as in splendour and grandeur.

The question now arises—"What is the denotation of the word Veda? Does the word Veda denote only the four Scriptures R̥k, Yajur, Sāman and Atharvan, or are the Itihāsas and Purāṇas also to be regarded as Vedas? The answer is not far to seek. Owing to the very great vastness and highly complicated nature of the Vedas, and in view again of the short span of life and scanty intellect of human beings in this Kali age it is not at all possible for a man in his whole life time to acquire a complete mastery over the Vedas which thus remain unintelligible to men. Indeed in ages long gone by when the span of human life was not short and intellect was very great, it was possible for the sages that led a purely ascetic life to study and master the entire Vedas. But those very sages, it is curious to note, understood one and the same Veda in different lights, as is evident from their statements that are often times conflicting. The true import of the Vedas thus remained quite in the dark, and to make it clear appeared the Purāṇas

1. cf. ऋग्यजुः सामाथर्व्वश्च भाग्नं पञ्चरात्रकम् । मूलगमाय-
णञ्चैव शास्त्रमित्यभिधीयते ॥ Skandapurāṇa text cited
in the Mallabharṇasūtra, p. 10.

through the instrumentality of the great sage Vyāsa who is nothing but an incarnation of the Absolute Being. The Purāṇas, therefore, serve merely as an interpreter of the Vedas. Those portions of the Vedas which are now lost to us can be inferred to have once existed through the medium of the corresponding ideas in the Purāṇas. Moreover, in some places we find ideas tersely or vaguely put in the Śruti Texts, and whose very ideas are clearly elucidated in the Purāṇas. As has been well said in the Mahābhārata and in the Manu smṛti—"The meanings of the Vedas must be made clear by means of the Itihāsas and Purāṇas" (cf. इतिहासपुराणाभ्यां वेदं समुपबृंहयेत्—Śaṭsāṅdarbha, p. 7.).

The Purāṇas therefore are to be regarded as a supplement to the Vedas, and this is evident from the very name पुराण which word in Sanskrit means 'that which fills up or supplements'. A supplement can not be different in kind from that which is supplemented. The defective part or parts of a gold bangle is made good by gold alone and not by any other metal.

✓ The relation, however, which thus appears between the Vedas and the Purāṇas is not one of pure identity but of non-difference as well as difference—non-difference because both are revealed, and difference because while in the Vedas proper differences in accentuation like Udātta, Anudātta, Svarita etc. are minutely and carefully observed, there is no such thing in the texts of the Purāṇas. This conclusion about the Purāṇas being Vedas is corroborated by various Scriptural texts viz (1) "Oh Maitreyī, R̥k, Yajuh Sāman, Atharvan, Itihāsa and Purāṇa came out directly and easily from the Absolute Being as if they were manifest in His exhalation (एवं वा अरे महतो भूतस्य निःश्वसिनमेतद् यद् ऋग्वेदो यजुर्वेदः सामवेदो ऽथर्ववेदश्च इतिहासः पुराणम्—

—Maitr. Up. VI, 32); also Vṛh. IV, 4, 10; (2) "The All-seeing Being created from all His mouths Itihāsas and Purāṇas—the Fifth Veda" इतिहासपुराणानि पञ्चमं वेदमीश्वरः । सर्वेभ्यः ।

/ एव वक्त्रेभ्यः ससृजे सर्वं दर्शनः Bhāg. III, 12, 39, (3) "I am studying, O Lord, Ṛk Veda, Yajurveda, Sāmveda, Atharvan—the Fourth Veda, and Itihāsas and Purāṇas the Fifth in serial order of the Vedas" ऋग्वेदं भगवो अध्येमि यजुर्वेदं सामवेदमाथर्वणं चतुर्थमितिहासं पुराणं पञ्चमं वेदानां वेदम्—Chhā. VII, 1, 2; (4) The same fact thus corroborated is strengthened further by a great number of texts of the Vāyu Purāṇa, the Skanda Purāṇa, the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa and others which however it is difficult to quote here in full for want of space. ¹

The Vāyu Purāṇa states further a special reason why the Purāṇas are regarded as the fifth Veda. While in the Vedas Ṛk and others we find amongst other things an account of the performance of sacrificial rites by the agency of the fourfold personalities called Ṛtvik, Adhvaryu, Udgāta and Brahmā, there is no such thing to be found in the Purāṇas. On the other hand, the portions of the Vedas called Ākhyāna, Upākhyānā, Gāthā and Kalpa are elaborately dealt with in the Purāṇas, and hence a Purāṇa is defined as one treating of five topics. These five main topics consist of cosmogony, description of the earth, the doctrine of the cosmic ages, the exploits of deities, saints and heroes, accounts of the incarnations of Viṣṇu, the genealogies of the solar and lunar races of kings, rules about the worship of God and deities by means of prayers, fasting, votive offerings, pilgrimages and the like. The conclusion of the Vāyu Purāṇa is thus a settled one, viz, that the portions that are tersely, implicitly and vaguely stated in the Ṛk and others

are elucidated in the Purāṇas. In other words, the Purāṇas are the same as the Vedas.¹

Again we come to know from the Matsya Purāṇa that the implicit portions of the R̥k and others, referred to above, were indeed current in toto in the celestial region amongst gods in the shape of hundred crores of slokas, but seeing the intellect of human beings not sufficient to grasp and retain such a big volume, the Absolute Being appearing as the Incarnation Vyāsa simplified and codified these hundred crores of slokas into a system of four lacs of verses and exposed them amongst human beings in the shape of eighteen volumes. Thereby also the same conclusion is arrived at, viz, that the Purāṇas are not different from the Vedas.²

In the Śiva Purāṇa also the same idea is expressed somewhat elaborately thus:— The great sage and incarnation Kṛṣṇa Dwaipāyana by way of analysing the entire Veda made out a classification of the same into the four—R̥k, Yajuh, Sāman, and Atharvan, for which act of analysing his name is Vedavyāsa (the word Vyāsa coming from root वृक् to analyse). By the same Kṛṣṇa Dwaipāyana the contents of the entire Purāṇa, still in vogue amongst the gods in the shape of hundred crores of verses, were codified and consummated into four lacs of verses in order that they in this less elaborate form might suit human intelligence.³ And the contents of these four lacs of verses were separately expounded amongst mankind by eighteen different sages Brahmā, Skanda etc., whence evidently is the classification of eighteen Purāṇas. The number eighteen is, however, not to be understood in the sense that the different Purāṇas were composed by eighteen personages, for in that case the

1. See Appendix.

2. „ „

3. „ „

Purāṇas would, contrary to fact, be regarded as non-eternal.

Although the Purāṇas are thus included in the Vedas, yet from one point of view their superiority over the four Vedas R̥k etc. cannot be denied. The authors of the Hindu Śāstras, for reasons best known to themselves, have specifically laid down that to the study of the four vedas only the twice born classes are entitled, and that the Śūdra class as well as women in general are excluded from the right of studying them. To the study of the Purāṇas, however, all men, irrespective of caste, sex, age etc., are equally entitled. The only reason for this cosmopolitan character of the Purāṇas is that although they deal with varieties of topics their subject matter is centred round one point from the knowledge of which no body is barred, and that point is 'devotion and prayer to the Absolute Being.' Realisation of the Absolute Being and the means thereto cannot, in the fairness of things, be the birth-right of a few select classes, and there is no reason whatsoever why women and Śūdras—the created beings of one and the same Almighty Being—should be excluded from the right of attaining the Summum bonum of life. As has been well said in the Skanda Purāṇa, Prabhāsakhyaṇḍa—“ The name of the Absolute Being Kṛṣṇa which is the sweetest of all,—the eternal fountain-head to supply sweetness to all things, which is the highest bliss of all blisses—the eternal spring from which flow all streams of bliss, and which is the absolutely real fruit of the eternal creeper-like Vedas, and is a thing not at all earthly but made up of pure chit—this name Kṛṣṇa, when uttered once at least in faith or without faith, raises all beings whatsoever high up from the trammels of mundane existence.

(मधुरमधुरमेतन्मङ्गलं मङ्गलानां सकलनिगमवह्निसिन्धुफलं चित्स्वरू-

पम् । सकृदपि परिगीतं श्रद्धया हेलया वा भृगुवरं नरमात्रं तारयेत् कृष्ण नाम ॥)

In this important fact of their being accessible to all beings lies the superexcellence of the Purāṇas. Besides, the Purāṇas are also to be regarded as higher than the Saṃhitā texts of Manu, Yājñavalkya and others for the reason that the personality of their expounder Vyāsa far surpasses that of Manu and others. It has been well said in the Padma Purāṇa¹—“ Even Hiraṇyagarbha Brahmā and others could not realise what the great sage Vyāsa realised. He knew what others knew, but there were many things known to him which were not known to others. Herein lies the superiority of Vyāsa over others”. In this connection, however, it is to be noted that the theory of eternal cycle of creation being accepted there cannot be one Veda-Vyāsa but many. In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa Parāśara says “My son Vyāsa, in the 28th Manvantara, analysed the Veda into four. A similar analysis of the Vedas is effected by many other Vyāsas and by myself. In the four Yugas at different cycles of creation the different branches of the Vedas are expounded by different Vyāsas. Of these Vyāsas, the one that appeared in the 28th Manvantara in the Dwāpara Yuga and revealed the Mahābhārata as well as the Bhāgavata is an incarnation of the Absolute Being and as such is superior to others”. (III, 4, 2-5).

The superiority of the Purāṇa—Vedas over the four vedas, which is thus indicated, may be further strengthened by other important facts. The central theme of the Vedas is indeed to aim at Right Apprehension; in other words, the Pramā in the Vedas is knowledge of, and constant devotion and prayer to, the Absolute Being. But from the manner of

1. See Appendix.

treatment it is hardly possible to understand this main issue. From the fact that there is apparently no consistency between the beginning and the conclusion as well as from the constant reference to Vinīyoga, it appears as if the Vedas aim at ritualistic observances, and this very fact has been erroneously taken by the Mīmāṃsā Philosopher Jaimini as the supreme end of life. The mere act of performing sacrificial rites in strict accordance with the injunctions laid down, though it might be useful as an auxiliary process, can never by itself and without any reference to the knowledge thereof be the summum-bonum of life. Such a theory seems rather absurd and ridiculous—it does not tally at all with any of the extant religious theories of the world. Religion, if it is properly called Religion, is based upon man's intuitive belief or faith in the Absolute Being. This intuitive belief may at first appear as blind faith, but by strict adherence to certain principles, by a constant earnest practice of these principles, the blind faith becomes developed into a clear vision and true knowledge of the Absolute Reality. This important fact constitutes the essential characteristic of all religions of the civilized nations of the world, and this very fact is the preeminent characteristic of the religion of the Hindus also.

The Vedas, therefore, cannot but aim at Right Apprehension of the Absolute Reality. But this vital point—rather the only point—lies hidden in the Vedas as a rux. It is a hard knot which it is not at all possible for the scanty intellect of human beings specially of the Kali age to rend asunder. The great sage Vyāsa having analysed the Vedas realised this difficulty, and out of sincere compassion for His Beings expressed this in clear terms. Moreover, commentators on the Vedas—both ancient and modern, understood them in different lights, and hence it is not at all possible to make out

the true import of the Vedas from amongst the various commentaries. This true meaning therefore has been expressed by the expounder himself in the supplementary Vedas, the Purāṇas. Thus it is stated in the Nāradiya Purāṇa—"There is no doubt that the meaning of the Vedas is firmly established in the Purāṇas".¹ Indeed different commentators have tried in their own way to unravel the meaning of the Vedas, but in view of the innumerable branches of the Vedic study, what these commentators have really read seems rather too meagre and insignificant, and with this scanty knowledge it is simply a veritable impudence on their part to set up a meaning of the illimitable ocean of vedic study. Besides, when the analyst of the Vedas himself has made a full exposition and elucidation thereof in the shape of the Purāṇas, it is simply a foolish act to grope in the dark by way of going through the forced artificial commentaries of a few so called Pandits of mediocre intellect and learning. Further, it is to be noted that though many portions of the Vedas which are not now accessible to us can be inferred to have once existed from the corresponding ideas now to be found in the Smṛti texts of Manu and others (cf. त्वमेको ह्यस्य सर्वस्य विधानस्य स्वयम्भुवः । अचिन्त्यस्याप्रमेयस्य कार्यतत्त्वार्थवित् प्रभो ॥ Manu Chp-1, 3), but the Purāṇas contain many things that can be found at present neither in the Vedas nor in the Smṛti texts. This fact also proves the superiority of the Purāṇas over the Śrutis and Smṛtis. Hence he who has studied the Vedas along with the six subsidiary studies as well as the Smṛtis but not the Purāṇas, can never be called a truly learned one".²

Although the authoritativeness of the Purāṇas is thus

1. See Appendix.

2. " " " " " "

established, yet there arises another doubt as to their final admissibility. "From the Matsya Purāṇa¹ we come to know that the Kalpa period has three main phases, viz-(1) the Sāttvika Kalpa in which owing to the preponderance of the Sāttva Guṇa, faith in the glory of the Absolute Being Hari is manifest every where; (2) Rājasa Kalpa in which owing to the preponderance of the Rājas Guṇa the simple faith in Hari degenerates into that in Hiraṇyagarbha Brahmā, a remote aspect of the Absolute, (3) Tāmasa Kalpa in which owing to the preponderance of the Tamas Guṇa adoration to Śiva as well as to performance of sacrifices becomes predominant. Accordingly, the Purāṇas also appeared at different Kalpa periods in these three different phases and men of moderate intellect are at a loss to make out which of these is the most admissible and the best authority. And this inability is owing to their ignorance of the important fact laid down in the Hari Vaṃśa viz that as in the Veda, in the Rāmāyaṇa, in the Mahābhārata, so in the Purāṇa—in whatever phase it appears, glory of the Absolute Being is sung implicitly or explicitly from the beginning to the end". To remove this doubt the Matsya Purāṇa states clearly which of the Purāṇas are Sāttvika, which are Rājāsika and which Tāmāsika; and to determine the comparative excellence of these three classes of Purāṇa it further states that those of the Sāttvika class are the best in view of the fact that preponderance of the Sāttva Guṇa in which the two other Guṇas are conquered prepares the mind for that state of calmness and composure in which, as if on a clean mirror, the ever flowing grace of God becomes clearly reflected i.e. absorbed, and the mind thus constituted can entertain a hope for realisation of the Absolute Ideal.

1. See Appendix.

Chapter III. SUPREME AUTHORITATIVENESS OF THE BHĀGAVATA.

The superiority of the Sāttvika Purāṇas being thus established, there arises still another difficulty. In the Purāṇas of this class we find Brahman described differently in different places, viz, as possessed of attributes, as devoid of attributes, as possesser of the only attribute knowledge, as unintelligent, and so on. The question now is, How to reconcile these different theories so as to arrive at the best theory about the Absolute Reality? A reconciliation however is possible only if we look to the Brahman Sūtras composed by the same sage Veda Vyāsa. But, again, the Sūtras themselves are written in such a concise form that it is very difficult to make out the true meaning which the author had in view. Indeed the word Sūtra (सूत्र) is defined as 'one of the fewest possible words, unambiguous, weighty, with wide application, without a superfluous letter in it, and faultless.'¹ To unravel the meaning of the Sūtras attempts have been made by different commentators e. g. Vowdhāyana, Taitika, Yādava, Nimvārka, Madhwāchāryya, Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Valadeva Vidyabhūṣaṇa and others in their respective commentaries or Bhāṣyas. These commentators, it cannot be denied, were all intellectual giants equally possessed of a wonderful power of reasoning; and so their attempt must no doubt be regarded as commendable. But the difficulty lies in the fact that they do not agree with one another. Being unmindful of the true function of a Bhāṣya,² each tried his best to set up

1. The verse is—**अल्पाक्षरमसिन्दिग्धं सारवद् विश्वतो मुखम् ।
अस्तोभमनवद्यच्च सूत्रं सूत्रविदो विदुः ।**

2. The true function of a Bhāṣya lies in the explanation of the words of a Sūtra in accordance with the general body of the Sūtras as well as in the explanation of its own words.

his own theory based however on different Śruti Texts severally selected for his own purpose, and in so doing, it might be that they were guided by their own biases. Bacon might have advanced his own pet theory that in all scientific investigation as also in interpreting things the mind must be got rid of the fourfold phantoms, but such a valuable doctrine lives more in theory than in practice. No body has ever been able to explain a philosophical theory with an unbiased mind—in Europe as well as in India. Had it been so there would not have been so many different interpreters of one and the same Hegelian Theory as McTeggart, Wallace, Caird and others.

In the face of these different commentaries it is very difficult for one to choose from amongst them the true meaning of the Sūtras. That which is absolutely true can be one and one only. Singularity is the inseparable characteristic of truth. The pragmatic value of a thing is determined not simply by truth but also by an all-sided applicability.

Consequently, the true meaning of the Sūtras, which constitutes the true theory of the Vedānta, can be one and one only; and that again becomes charmingly true which combines within itself all of them and yet transcends them. Herein lies the best reconciliation of differences. Unity irrespective of differences is a mere empty abstraction—an illusion so to say—a mere void ending in a fuss. The Hegelian Dialectic recognises as real or concrete unity that alone in which the differences are admitted and conquered, and which is thus unity-in-differences. The question now is—How to get hold of that meaning of the Sūtras which is in reality one and true. There is only one way of getting at it. If there is available once such Purāṇa which contains in a nutshell, as it were, the whole contents of all the Revealed Scriptural texts,—Itihāsas and Purāṇas, and at the same time which ascertains the real meaning of the Brahman

Sūtras, then and then only a reconciliation of all the different definitions and descriptions of Brahman that are to be found in the Sāttvika Purāṇas, as well as of all the different commentaries on the Brahman Sūtras is possible. And that sacred treasure-trove of the Hindus, that illuminating Śāstra which is regarded by Vaiṣṇavas as the crest jewel of all scriptural texts of the Hindus, is the famous Bhāgavata Purāṇa expounded by the sage Vyāsa. What then is this Bhāgavata Purāṇa, and why is it to be regarded as the best final authority in the matter of Hindu Religion with special reference to its Viṣṇuī Sect?

That Purāṇa which contains eighteen thousand verses in twelve Skandhas (Books) and which begins with an explanation of the sacred Gāyatrī is called the Bhāgavata Purāṇa.¹ The sage Vyāsa after having revealed all the other Purāṇas composed the Brahman-Sūtras. But the Sūtras happened to be couched in such a language and style that it was not at all easy to draw out the meaning underlying them. The wonderful and inconceivable acts of the Absolute Lord, indicative of His omnipotence, tempered and dominated by His Infinite Bliss and graceful charm, was involved in the Sūtras in such an ambiguous and implicit form that the author himself whose object was to express them clearly could not be satisfied with this. He divined this difficulty in his spiritual meditation, and in that state of ecstasy got hold of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa and revealed the same to the view of mankind with the sole intention that it would serve as his own commentary on his own work the Brahman-Sūtras. The dominating feature and marked superiority of this Purāṇa lies in the fact that in the proper understanding of its contents is possible an adequate reconciliation of all the scriptural texts of the Hindus; and this follows as a corollary from the fact that the beginning verse is nothing but an elucidation of the sacred Gāyatrī. Truly has it been

1. See Appendix.

said in the Garuḍa Purāṇa—"The Bhāgavata Purāṇa is the best interpretation of the Brahman Sūtras, the unfolders of the meaning underlying the texts of the Mahābhārata, and the supreme Bhāṣya on the Gāyatrī; it teems with the meaning of the Vedas, Ṛk and others; as Sāman is to the Vedas, so it is to all the Purāṇas; it is the direct revelation of the Absolute Lord, and consists of eighteen-thousand verses divided into twelve skandas.¹ To elucidate this vital point it is but meet that we should explain the first sloka of the Bhāgavata in its bearing upon the Brahman Sūtras and the Gāyatrī.

A thorough exposition of the First Verse of the Bhāgavata as the unfolders of the true meaning of the Brahman Sūtras and the Gāyatrī :—

The first sloka runs thus—

जन्माद्यस्य यतोऽन्वयादितरतश्चाथैष्वभिन्नः स्वराद्
तेने ब्रह्महृदा य आदिकवये मुह्यन्ति यन् सूरयः ।
तेजो वारिमृदां यथा विनिमयो यत्र त्रिसर्गोऽमृषा
धाम्ना स्वेन सदा निरस्तकुहकं सत्यं परं धीमहि ॥

The Vedānta Sūtras begin with the Sūtra अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा "Then therefore the enquiry into Brahman". The meaning of the Sūtra is involved in the latter half of the above verse तेजो वारि.....धीमहि. The word Brahman in the Sūtra denotes the Highest Person (पुरुषोत्तम) who is essentially free from all imperfections and possesses numberless classes of auspicious (अप्राकृत i. e. absolutely different from those qualities that are to be found in created beings) qualities of unsurpassable excellence. Secondly, the term Brahman is applied to any thing that possesses the quality of greatness, but primarily denotes that which possesses greatness of essential nature as well as of qualities in unlimited fullness, and such a thing is only the Lord of all. The

1. See Appendix.

case is analogous to that of the term भगवन् which denotes primarily the Absolute Lord and secondarily the incarnations of the Absolute and also any holy person. This latter distinction is clearly expressed by the two words स्वयं भगवान् and भगवान् of which the former is applied only to the Absolute Reality Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the subject matter of this treatise, and the latter to those whose Lordliness is not absolute but dependant upon or relative to the Absolute Kṛṣṇa. Thus the word Brahman in the Sūtra surely means the ultimate Reality—the Lord of all, and hence is identical with स्वयं भगवान्. This very conception of the Absolute is attached to the word परम् in the Bhāgavata sloka. How? The word पर in Sanskrit means, amongst other things, 'chief', and this chiefness may be with respect to a small class or group of things, e. g. Devadatta is the chief of the class of boys in this college. But by reason of the Hyper-connotation of terms called सुकृपग्रहा योगवृत्ति the word पर here must mean the foremost chief—the chief of the highest class of things; and this can be no other than the Absolute Being—the Ultimate Reality (मूलरूप)—the Greatest of all, Brahman. It is to be noted further that this ultimate Reality is the soul of all, and yet stands above all; that is to say, It is both Transcendent and Immanent, just in the same way as the sun according to Hindu conception is the origin of the rays and yet something different from the rays themselves.

Next the word जिज्ञासा. Derivatively the word means 'desire for knowledge' (of Brahman), and, as Rāmānuja has truly said, this knowledge which the Vedānta texts aim at indicating is the knowledge other than the mere knowledge of the sense of sentences, and is denoted by such synonymous terms as ध्यान, उपासना etc. (i. e. meditation). With this view agree the Scriptural texts viz.—Having known it, let him practise meditation (Vph. Up. IV, 4, 21); "Meditate on the Self as Om (Mu. Up.

II 2. 6): "Let a man meditate on the Self only as his world" (Vrh. Up. I. 4. 15). "The Self is to be sighted, to be heard, to be reflected on, to be meditated upon" (Vrh. Up IV, 5. 6). Meditation again means steady remembrance, i.e. a continuity of steady remembrance uninterrupted like the flow of oil, in agreement with the Scriptural passage which declares steady remembrance to be the means of release, viz.,—"On the attainment of remembrance all the ties are loosened" (Chhā. Up. VII, 26, 2). This conception is also involved in the word धीमहि in the sloka which in Sanskrit is the first person plural form of the root ध्यै (to meditate, ध्यान). The plural number in the verb implies that the Absolute Lord Kṛṣṇa is the object of meditation not only of Vyāsa the expounder of the Purāṇas, but also of all beings existing at all times and in all spaces, as well as of all the different innumerable secondary Lords or High Priests that are the different aspects of the Absolute and serve as the knowers of the selves of the innumerable beings in the innumerable Brahmāṇḍas.

Now we come to the word अथानः. To explain this we must state at first that there are two parts in the Veda, viz— (a) the Karmakāṇḍa dealing with rituals or performances of sacrificial rites, and (b) the Jñānakāṇḍa dealing with knowledge of or devotion to Brahman. The Karmakāṇḍa is the earlier part, since the Śrīntis, seeing that individual souls forgetting their natural function of devotion become addicted to and take delight in the transient effects of the Māyā Śakti, first satisfy them with such things, and with that object enjoin the acts of sacrifices and the like whereby they take birth in different regions like earth, elysium etc., and in this way gradually withdrawing their mind from these transitory worldly objects teach them in the long run something permanent i.e. knowledge of Brahman. The system of Philosophy based on the earlier part is called the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā and

that on the latter part is called the Uttara Mīmāṃsā or Vedānta. Since, then, the fruit of sacrificial rites as enjoined in the Mīmāṃsā System is limited and non-permanent, and since the effect of Brahman jñāna enjoined in the latter Mīmāṃsā is unlimited and permanent, the Brahman Sūtras begin with the statement that Brahman is to be known after the knowledge of Vedic rites has previously taken place and effected the preparatory stage of the mind. And the meaning hereby indicated is expressed by the two words अथातः, for the word अथ means 'after' and अतः means 'for this reason.' Again, the two characteristics of limit-ness and non-permanence attached to the fruit of Vedic rites imply that this fruit which consists in the enjoyment of elysium etc. is variable in character and hence not true, whereas the other two characteristics of 'unlimitedness and permanence' attached to Brahmanjñāna indicate that this is true and real, for unchangeableness is inseparably connected with truth and reality; and it is this belief in its truth that induces us to inculcate the knowledge of Brahman, in other words, induces us to seek after that pure bliss or Premānanda which comes as an inevitable consequence of the knowledge or devotion to the Absolute. The Absolute Being, therefore, cannot but be true, for the knowledge and bliss constitute the very essence of the supreme body of the Absolute Lord. Hence the Absolute Lord (परम्) has been described as True (सत्यम्) in the śloka.

Moreover, the word सत्य derivatively means "सने हितम्" "that which is beneficial to an existent one"—"that to whose existence the existence of all beings is due, and hence the ever-existent non-decaying Ultimate Reality". It is also an Uplaksana and so implies 'itself as well as the two other concomitant attributes of knowledge and bliss,'

for the Śruti says सत्यं ज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म (Tait. II, I, 1); in other words, the Absolute Being is Satchidānanda—Vigraha.

The expression धाम्ना.....कुहकम् explains the reason why the Absolute Being is called the foremost chief (पर). On the authority of the Amarkoṣa text गृहदेहत्विद् प्रभावाः (the synonyms of धामन् are house, body, lustre and prowess) the word धाम्ना here is to be taken in the sense of power or luminosity; and the word कुहक means that which deludes, and this delusion can be the effect of no other thing than the Māyā Śakti of the Absolute Lord. The expression, therefore, means 'that which by the sole instrumentality of its auspicious power and lustre overthrows its own Śakti—the Māyā'; and the instrumental case in धाम्ना indicates that in overpowering the Māyā Śakti the power and glory of the Absolute Lord has the greatest capacity—nay, it is only the glory or bliss-potency of the Absolute Lord that can do this, for what else can possibly conquer Māyā which being but one kind of Śakti of the Absolute is mighty enough to produce manifold wonderful creation and effects in the universe. This very idea also occurs in the Gītā text—दैवीह्येषा गुणमयी मम माया दुरत्यया । मामेव ये प्रपद्यन्ते मायामेतां तरन्ति ते ॥—VII, 14. Herein lies the absoluteness of the Absolute. The words स्वेन धाम्ना as explained just now indicate further that though the Māyā is but a Śakti of the Absolute Lord, yet the Latter by dint of His inconceivable unfathomable bliss potency is not affected in the least by the effect of Māyā. On the other hand, the Absolute lord in His intrinsic self-hood is a different from Māyā—or, to speak in other words, the Absolute being Satchidānanda bears to Māyā the relation of difference as well as non-difference.

The fact that the Absolute is true (सत्य) has led some Vedāntists to conclude that the world is false, the sum and substance of their theory being "Brahman is true, the world is false, the individual soul is but identical with Brahman and nothing whatsoever". But, as will be fully discussed later on, this theory of the opponent Vedāntist is entirely untenable, and accordingly the external world should not be regarded as false but true. It is to be noted; however, that there is a difference between the truth of Brahman and that of the world; while Brahman is absolutely true, the world is relatively so; in other words, whatever existence the world has is all due to the existence of the Absolute Lord. It is with this object in view that the Absolute Lord has been described as Satya in the śloka, and this view is corroborated by a volume of scriptural texts e. g. "True of the true, Prāṇas (i. e. subtle and gross elements) are true, (He is) True of those"—(Vāh. II, 3) which evidently indicate that, while the world consisting of subtle and gross things is true, the Absolute Lord is absolutely true.

Thus after all the sense of the first sūtra of the Vedānta is clearly shown to be involved in the latter half of the first śloka of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. Let us next try to show how the sense of the second, third and fourth sūtras is involved in the first half of the same śloka, viz,— जन्माद्यस्य यतोऽन्वयात् etc.

A thing can be defined in two ways, viz (1) by pointing out its essential marks (स्वरूपलक्षण) (2) by pointing out its collateral marks (तटस्थलक्षण). The first may be regarded as corresponding to the logical Definition, while the second to what is called Description in logic. Thus the fact that the Absolute is True, Knowledge, Bliss

and Infinite, constitutes the Swarūpa Lakṣaṇa of Brahman, and this has been stated in the two words Satya and Para in the śloka. The other kind of definition—Tatastha Lakṣaṇa—is stated in the second Veda. Sūtra जन्माद्यस्य यतः. The Sūtra means that Brahman or the Absolute is that Highest Person who is the ruler of all, whose nature is antagonistic to all evil, who possesses infinite auspicious qualities such as knowledge, blessedness etc., who is omniscient, omnipotent, supremely merciful, and from which proceed the creation, sustentation and reabsorption of this entire world with its manifold wonderful arrangement not to be fathomed by thought and comprising within itself the aggregate of living souls from Brahmā—(Hiraṇyagarbha) down to blades of grass all of which experience the fruits (of their former action) in definite places and at definite times. This definition of the Absolute is founded on the texts—"Bhṛgu Vāruṇi went to his father Varuṇa saying Sir, teach me Brahman etc", up to "That from which these beings are born, that by which, when born, they live, that into which they enter at their dissolution, try to know that, that is Brahman (Taitt III, 1, 1), and also on the text—"That created fire—". (Chhā. VI, 2, 3).

The same Tatastha Lakṣaṇa is also contained in the very beginning of the Bhāgavata śloka which therefore means that we meditate upon that Absolute Lord who by means of His inconceivable omnipotence is both the efficient and material cause of the creation subsistence, reabsorption of the entire world described above. It is to be noted, however, in this connection that though the Absolute is both Transcendent and Immanent, yet He is to be meditated upon by His beings only in His aspect of Transcendence in which state, being entirely unaffected by the inauspicious effects of

His own Māyā Śakti. He possesses endless auspicious qualities of supreme excellence, and this the highest aspect of the Absolute is what the present treatise is going to establish as Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Besides, strictly speaking, the Highest Person in His intrinsic selfhood is not the direct cause of the creation etc. of the world; it is the Puruṣa, an emanation or remote aspect of the Absolute Lord Kṛṣṇa, which, being attended with the material cause Prakṛti, is the direct efficient cause of the creation etc. of the world; yet this direct causality is ascribed to the Absolute Lord just in the same way as a fish or hark which is really born in a part of the ocean is generally described as born in the ocean, or as the act of administration of a country, though directly done by officials and people, is ascribed to the viceroy. Further, it is to be observed that being the supreme cause of the world, which has clearly an embodied form, the Absolute Being, in opposition to the purely Monistic Theory of the Vedānta, must possess a form and body of his own. And the reason is obvious:—In the world itself we find innumerable forces, by way of acting and reacting, produce innumerable embodied things, and these forces are never found to produce any thing without themselves inhering in embodied things sensible or insensible; these small forces again, in the Inductive Deductive process, can be shown to be traced to force some which is the highest; evidently therefore the highest force cannot but act without inhering in some embodied thing which is surely the auspicious body of the Absolute Lord containing within itself the germs of all kinds of bodies.

The above definition of the Absolute is strengthened by the third and fourth sūtras. The third sūtra शास्त्रयो-
नित्वात् can be explained in two ways:—(A) Owing to the illfoundedness of argumentation as also to the fact that

Brahman is raised far above all contact with the senses, Brahman is not an object of perception and the other sources of knowledge, but to be known through Scriptures alone. Therefore the texts such as "whence these creatures are born etc." have to be accepted as instructing us about the true nature of the Absolute.

The illfoundedness of reasoning may be shown thus—
 (i) As against the theory of Brahman being the cause of creation etc. of the world, some, being ignorant of the true meaning of the sūtra **लोकवत्तु लीलाकैवल्यम्**, might argue thus: Souls that have got release are never known to be the doers of things because they have got no desires unfulfilled and so no motives for acting; the Absolute is a Being in whom all desires beings realised there is no scope for motives; hence the Absolute cannot be the doer of any act e. g. the creation etc. of the world. (ii) Others might argue: Jars and the like are effects and are found to be produced by individual souls; hence the external world which with its manifold names and forms is indeed an effect must be created by an individual soul or souls, and so the agency of Brahman need not be brought in. (iii) A third party might come forward with some other argument, and so on ad regressum.

In this way it might be shown that in case Brahman be at all established by means of perception or any other means of proof in any philosophical system, this will be nullified by counter-arguments in other systems, and because such counterarguments may proceed in endless ways, there is no help admitting what has already been established, viz. that scriptures alone—nothing but scriptures—are the authority for establishing the Absolute Lord—the prime cause of the creation etc. of the world.

(B) In the second sūtra the causality of the creation

etc. of the world is ascribed to Brahman. Why is it, the opponent might argue, that this causality is assigned to Brahman and not to unconscious matter or to some individual soul or souls? The reason is this—From the Śruti अरेऽस्य महतो.....सूत्राणि (Vṛh. II, 4, 10) we know that the Scriptures which consist of endless knowledge of divers kinds are the direct revelation of the Absolute Being; and because the eternal words of the Vedas play an important part in the matter of creation (cf Śruti—“एन इति प्रजापतिर्देवान सृजत असृग्रमिति मनुष्यानिन्दव इति पितृं स्तिरः पवित्रमिति ग्रहानाशव इति स्तोत्रं विश्वानीति शस्त्रमभि सौभगेत्यन्याः प्रजाःquoted in Kulluka's commentary on the verse— “सर्वेष्वान्तु स नामानि कर्माणि च पृथक् पृथक् । वेदशब्देभ्य एवादौ पृथक् संस्थाश्च निर्म्ममे ॥ Manu Ch. I, 21) the Absolute Being, the direct revealer of the Vedas, cannot but be the cause of creation: moreover, the creation is such a wonderful thing consisting of such a manifold diversity of names and forms that it can only be caused by the Omniscient, Omnipotent primeval being—the Absolute Lord, and not by unconscious matter unaided, nor by any individual soul or souls. Although thus the most primeval source of the Vedas, the Absolute Lord reveals them amongst beings at the beginning of every cycle of creation not directly but through the first-hand instrumentality (आदिकवये) of Hiraṇyagarbha Brahmā in whose heart the same Lord ever resides as the Immanent Regulator. This very idea, which is based upon the text यो ब्रह्माणं विदधाति पूर्वं यो वै वेदं दधाति पूर्वं यो वै वेदांश्च प्रहिणोति तस्मै तं ह देवमात्मबुद्धि=प्रकाशं मुमुक्षुर्वै शरणमहं प्रपद्ये.....Śveta. VI, 18, is indicated by the expression तेने ब्रह्महृदा य आदिकवये in the Bhāgavata Śloka. The word आदिकवये signifies that

though Brahmā is the first teacher of the Vedas to the beings of a particular Brhmāṇḍa, yet his power of teaching being a derivative one, the Absolute Being is most fittingly styled the ultimate source of the Scriptures, and this is the real meaning of the third sūtra. It should not be redargued that some released soul or souls do this act of revealing the text, for, far be it said of such souls, even Padma-nābha Nārāyaṇa, while lying on the primeval supersensuous water gets stupified and bewildered at realising the endless auspicious qualities of the Highest Lord, so much so that he is called Śesa (meaning one who is unable to get across the illimitable ocean of qualities). This is the meaning signified by the words **मुह्यन्ति यत् सूरयः ।**

The Fourth Sūtra explained: It corroborates the third sūtra and means that the authoritativeness of scriptures with regard to Brahman is possible on account of Samanvaya i. e. proof both direct and indirect. In other words, all scriptural texts directly and indirectly establish the Absolute Lord as the highest aim of beings. Thus the texts—(a) Truth, Knowledge, the Infinite is Brahman (Taitt. Up. II, 1) (b) Bliss is Brahman (Taitt. Up. III, 6, 1) (c) one alone without a second is Brahman (Chhā. Up. 6, 2) (d) That is true, that is Self (Chhā. Up.) (e) 'Being only, my dear, this was in the beginning—or without a second (Chhā. Up. VI, 2) (f) Soul only there as in the beginning, the Person (Viṣ. Up. 1-4) (g) The Person—Nārāyaṇa (Nārāyaṇātharvaśira Upaniṣad) (h) It thought, may I be manifold, may I be born (Chhā. 6, 2) (i) From that—This Highest soul was created Ākāśa (Taitt.) (j) He created fire (Chhā. 6, 2) (k) whence are created the beings (Taitt. III, 2) (l) The Nārāyaṇa thought and then from Nār. was born Brahmā whence were created all beings (Nārāyaṇātharva I), " (m) Nārāyaṇa is the Absolute Lord the Ultimate Reality (Nār. II, 1-2) (n) (Row to) The

Highest Person who being dark-yellow is True, Real and the Absolute (Nār. I, 23) (o) That (Being) is this Lotus-eyed Lord whose body is Knowledge, from whom is the portion having lustre like that of lighting, Who is also styled Debaki's son and Madhusūdana (Nār. Atharvaśir 3)—these and other scriptural texts directly prove that Brahman is the Ultimate Reality, the Absolute Lord, the Highest Person who is True, Knowledge, Infinite, possessed of endless auspicious qualities, the Self of all, and the cause of the creation, subsistence and reabsorption of the entire universe, and from the last two quotations it appears that the Absolute Lord having knowledge as an ingredient of His auspicious body is dark-yellow in complexion and so might perhaps refer to Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa the subject matter of this treatise.

Again, the texts कथमसतः सज्जायेत " If there be no Reality as the starting point, how could the world which is a real thing be created ; " (Chhā. Up. VI, 2), को ह्येवान्यात् कः प्राण्यात् यदेष आकाश आनन्दो न स्यात् " who would have breathed, who would have lived, had this Ākāśa not been consisting of eternal bliss " (Taitt. Up. II, 7) एको ह वै नारायण आसीन्न ब्रह्मा न च शङ्करः " One alone Nārāyaṇa there was in the beginning, neither Brahman nor Śaṅkara " (Mahopaniṣad I), and similar other texts indirectly prove the same Absolute Lord as the ultimate Reality and the highest aim of beings.

It thus appears that the different scriptural texts cited above, and those not cited, however differently couched in language they might be, contain the same unflinching truth that the Absolute Lord of eternal Infinite Bliss is the Ultimate Reality and the cause of creation etc. of the world. This very fact is also clearly expressed in the Bhāgavata

śloka by the words **अन्वयादितरतश्चार्थेषु** which mean thus —From various scriptural texts it follows directly (**अन्वयात्**) as well as indirectly (**इतरतः**= other than **अन्वयात्** i. e. indirectly) that the One supreme Being revealed in the diverse texts is the cause of the creation etc. of the world, and because those very texts directly and indirectly prove that the Absolute Lord is consisting of supreme bliss, the realisation of such a Being is the summumbonum of life.

The word **अभिज्ञः** in the śloka may be regarded as involving the meaning of the fifth Vedānta Sūtra **ईक्षतेनशिद्धम्**. The Sūtra has been thus interpreted by Rānānujāchārya:—About the Chhāndogya Text. “Being only this was in the beginning, One only without a second. It though—may I be many, may I grow forth. It sent forth fire”, it has been argued by an opponent theorist that the word ‘this’ indicates the causal state viz the aggregate of things comprising manifold effects such as ether etc. consisting of the three guṇas—Goodness, Passion and darkness. And because such causal state is the equipoised condition of those three guṇas, and the Pradhāna taught by the great sage Kapila is this equipoised condition, therefore by the process of inference the text quoted which speaks of the origination of the world intimates the Pradhāna of Kapila,¹ in other words, the word

1. In connection with this view of interpretation of the Sūtra it might be said that if Kapila’s theory is really understood it will appear therefrom that creation does not proceed from Pradhāna considered in its sole aspect of unintelligent substance. It is when owing to the contiguity of Puruṣa the consciousness of the latter reflects itself upon the Pradhāna (just in the same way as owing to contiguity the redness of a Jaba flower reflects upon a white crystal which thereby looks red) that the equilibrium of the Guṇas in the Pradhāna is disturbed and evolution takes place in the order of

, Being' in the text means Pradhāna". This *prima facie* view is set aside by the words of the sūtra. Since the text exhibits the root ईक्ष् which means 'to think' as denoting a special activity on the part of what is termed 'Being', since again thinking cannot possibly belong to the Pradhāna which is unintelligent substance, the term Being therefore can denote only the all-knowing Highest Person who is capable of thought. In agreement with this we find that in all texts which speak of creation, the act of creation is stated to be preceded by thought--"He thought, shall I send forth worlds; He sent forth these worlds" (Ait. Āraṇ II, 4, 1, 2) "He thought, He sent forth Prāṇa (Vṛh. Up. VI, 3) Thus the word अभिज्ञः in the śloka, while indicating that creation etc. of the world is preceded by the thought and consciousness of the Absolute Lord, supplies a reason to

Mahat Principle, अहंकार etc. Kapila thereby really admits that conscious thought plays an important part in the matter of creation where Pradhana serves as the material cause. Indeed Kapila might not have been theistic in the sense in which a Vedantist is, and there might exist many points of difference between his theory and that of the Vedanta, but so far as the present point is concerned there seems to be no discrepancy between the two. Both equally, directly or indirectly, admit that creation is preceded by thought, the ईक्षण or thought of Brahman, and herein there is some sort of similarity to the Greek Theory which states that the connecting link between God and creation is supplied by Logos or primeval wisdom which manifests itself in two ways viz as Eternal word and Eternal reason or Nous. I am thus quite at a loss to understand why the commentators शंकर and रामानुज and even Jiva Goswami the reputed author of the Satsandarbhā, have criticised the theory of Kapila on this point in the aforesaid manner.

corroborate the fact of Brahman being the cause of creation as expressed in **जन्माद्यस्य यतः ।** Having explained so far the bearing of the Bhāgavata śloka upon the Vedānta Sūtra, let us next explain the bearing of the same upon the Gāyatri Text.

As the derivation **गायन्तं त्रायते या सा गायत्री** shows, Gāyatri is that which being sung or muttered saves the mutterer (from the trammels of mundane existence). What then is that thing? The scripture says **मिथते हृदयग्रन्थिश्लिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन् दृष्टे परावरे.** (Mund. II, 2, 8). "The tie of heart is broken, all doubts are removed, and all acts are annihilated when that Highest Self is seen." The trammels of mundane existence, again, are caused by acts done with a view to effects thereof, and consequently these are put an end to by self-realisation. Thus the meaning of the sacred Gāyatri can be nothing else than devotion to the Absolute Lord, for, as will be shown later on, devotion is the only means for attaining self-realisation in the fullest sense of the term. Besides, the Gāyatri is described as Veda-Mātā or the mother of the Vedas, and, as such, contains within itself in a nutshell as it were the essential meaning of all the Vedas i. e. Devotion to the Lord. Such being the case, the Gāyatri may be thus interpreted in the lines of the Agni Purāṇa.¹ The Praṇava Om, which is made up of the three letters standing for the initial letters of Aja-Brahmā, Upendra-Viṣṇu and Maheśvara, expresses the meaning of **जन्माद्यस्य यतः**, viz, that Brahman causes creation as Hiraṇyagarbha Brahman, subsistence as Viṣṇu, and reabsorption as Maheśvara. The three Vyāhrtis "**भूः, भुवः** and **स्वः**", which literally mean the three worlds, imply the whole pheno-

1. See Appendix.

menal world by the figure of speech called Upalakṣaṇa Vṛtti, and this is to be connected with the 'Om' so as to constitute the object of creation etc. The word तत्, means 'that which is established by the Scriptural texts'. The next word सवितुः is to be taken along with देवस्य which again is to be taken along with भर्गः; thus the meaning is "the lustre of that Being who is self-luminous and so illumines everything else—the sun included—by his own light. The word भर्ग which is derived from root भ्राज् 'to shine' means lustre. वरेण्य means superior i. e. superior to all other lustre. The clause धियो नः प्रचोदयात् means 'who has sent forth our intellect—the intellect of everything else excepting Himself, hence the understanding power of Hiraṇyagarbha Brahmā as well. Thus this clause corresponds to तेने ब्रह्महृदा य आदिकेवये in the śloka. The last word धीमहि needs no further explanation because already fully explained. The complete sense of the Gāyatri text¹ therefore is—"we contemplate and meditate upon the lustre—the lustrous Being or the Absolute Lord who is selfluminous (स्वराद्) whose lustre is superior to all lending forth lustre even to the sun (cf. न तत्र सूर्यो भाति न चन्द्रतारकं नेमा विद्युतो भान्ति कुतोऽयमग्निः । तमेव भान्तमनुभाति सर्वं तस्य भासा सर्वमिदं विभाति । Śvet. 6, 14), who is the source of whatever intellect is to be found in the whole creation in as much as He, in the aspect of the Immanent Regulator, serves as the teacher of all beings, who by taking recourse to His own Māyā Śakti appears in the threefold aspects of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Maheśvara and thereby creates, sustains and reabsorbs the whole phenomenal world simply by way of

1. The full text of the Gāyatri is this—

॥ ॐ ॥ भूर्भुवः स्वः ॥ तत् सवितुर्वरेण्यं भर्गो देवस्य
धीमहि धियो यो नः प्रचोदयात् ॥ ॐ ॥

making sports. Thus there is no difference in meaning between the first verse and the sacred Gāyatrī.

CHAPTER IV.

IMPORTANCE, POPULARITY & CONTENTS OF THE BHĀGAVATA

It has thus been clearly proved beyond doubt that the Bhāgavata Purāṇa is the best interpretation of the Vedānta Sūtras and of the Gāyatrī which contains the essence of all the four Vedas. Consequently, if one wants to acquire true definite knowledge of the Absolute, he must look to this Purāṇa which, as has been truly said, appeared as a supreme sum to dispel the gloom of ignorance of the men whose minds are greatly averse to religious consciousness. Such authoritativeness of the Bhāgavata is strengthened by the fact that the great sage Vyāsa, after having revealed the other seventeen Purāṇas and composed the Vedānta Sūtras, could not rest satisfied with these concise and vague statements, and hence was inclined to engage himself in deep meditation for the purpose of a fuller realisation. As a result of this deep meditation the true nature of the Absolute as the Highest Person in the fullest splendour of all His auspicious attributes was revealed to him. He realised therein how the individual soul, which in its intrinsic nature is nothing but pure chit and bliss and so beyond the affectation by the three guṇas, on account of its transgression or deviation from devotion to the Lord, is deluded by the Māyā Śakti and thereby forgetting its real self contradictorily thinks itself as consisting of the three guṇas and thus plunges itself into the ocean of untold miseries. He realised further how, by the grace of the Lord acting upon its own freedom of the will, the same soul by way

of practising the cult of Bhakti can restore its natural function and thereby rid itself of the clutches of miseries. The results of this spiritual exaltation were expressed by Vyāsa through the medium of language in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa.

Such revelation of the Absolute Lord to his devotee Vyāsa adds further to the authoritativeness of the Bhāgavata thereby making it regarded as an authority par excellence. Nor is it to be argued that it is Hindu religion alone which is based upon scriptures or Revelation. "Undoubtedly the notion of Revelation", says Principal Caird in his Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion, "may, rightly understood, of a supernatural revelation, is presupposed in the notion of religion, or forms the inseparable correlate of it. There can be no elevation of the finite spirit into communion with the Infinite which does not imply divine acts or divine process of self-revelation. Neither thought nor the aspiration of the religious nature can be satisfied with rationalistic notion of a merely subjective religion—of opinions and beliefs wrought out by the purely spontaneous activity of the human mind and implying nothing more on the divine side than is involved in the original creation of man's rational nature. A God who does not reveal Himself ceases to be god, and religious feeling, craving after a living relation to its object, refuses to be satisfied with a mere initial or potential revelation of the mind and will of God—with a God who speaks once for all and then through the whole course of history ceases to reveal Himself." (Page 60).

This very idea we find expressed in the Māthara Śruti text भक्तिरेवैनं गमयति भक्तिरेवैनं दर्शयति भक्तिवशः पूरुषः—

"Bhakti alone leads the individual self to the Lord, Bhakti alone makes the finite self see the Lord, and by means of Bhakti alone the Absolute is bound down in a living relation

to the self". Here, since the word Bhakti means the essence of the Hlādinī and Saṁvit Śaktis of the Lord, the underlying sense of the above texts evidently is that if religious craving is to be satisfied at all, it is by means of the Lord revealing, Himself to the devotee through the medium of the current of revelation flowing eternally between Himself and His constant beatific associates, and thereby the devotee is bound down to the Lord in some sort of living personal relationship e. g. Dāśya, Sakhya, Vātsalya etc.

The Bhāgavata Cult indirectly accepted by the great Saṁkarācārya and directly by other commentators—extensive popularity of the Bhāgavata :—

The authoritativeness of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, though sufficiently established by all sorts of argument based on Scriptural texts, will, I am afraid, be the more acceptable to many here and abroad if it can be shown that it was indirectly accepted even by Saṁkarācāryya. From the two Padma Purāṇa Texts स्वागमैः कल्पितैस्त्वञ्च जनान् मद्विमुखान् कुरु । माञ्च गोपय येन स्यात् सृष्टिरेपोत्तरोत्तरा ॥ (Padma Utt. Khaṇḍa Ch. 62, 31 cited in the Param. Sandarbha p. 221) and मायावादमसच्छास्त्रं प्रच्छन्नं बौद्धमुच्यते मयैव विहितं देवि कलौ ब्राह्मणमूर्तिना ॥ (Utt. Khaṇḍa ch. VI.) it appears that the great Saṁkarācāryya wrought out the theory of Absolute Monism and his peculiar doctrine of Māyā in obedience to the command of Lord Śiva which he obtained in his spiritual inspiration.¹ Really however he was a great devotee of the

1. A Similar idea also occurs in the Varaha purana text (cited in the Madhwa bhāṣya p 8, also in the Param. Sandarbha p. 221)

“एष सोऽहं सृजाम्याशु यो जनान् मोहयिष्यति ।

त्वञ्च रुद्र महाबाहो मोहशास्त्राणि काग्य ॥

Absolute Kṛṣṇa, for tradition says that he appeared as an incarnation of Śiva and Śiva according to the Vaiṣṇava theory is one of the greatest devotees to Kṛṣṇa. As such, Śaṅkara could not but be an advocate of the Bhakti Cult that lies imbedded in the Ślokas of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, and to bear testimony to this as well as for his self-satisfaction and beatific spirits he composed the famous Govindāsataka or "the Eight verses that deal with the Lilā of Kṛṣṇa." Or, to satisfy a rationalistic critic, we might put the thing in another way:—At the time when Śaṅkara flourished, Buddhism in the full-fledged form prevailed throughout the country—nay, it was abused in most cases. Having itself professed to be a revolt against the immoral and antisocial results of Brāhminism misunderstood, it, in its turn, being handled by ignorant people, led to far greater immoralities and vicious practices. And when these atrocities reached the climax, Śaṅkara wrote his famous commentary, preached his own doctrine, and established religious sanctuaries or maṭha in different places, simply as a check against the prevalent tyranny of religion, and for the revival of true Hinduism. But, alas, the course turned the other way. In his excessive zeal and undue bias for setting up his own pet theory, he twisted the scriptural texts, and in explanation thereof took to the Lakṣaṇā Vṛtti and Adhyāhāra in such an extreme way that his own theory ultimately turned to be Krypto-buddhism. He realised thereby the serious defect of his intellectual manipulation, and realised also the fact that true religion can never reveal it-

अतथ्यानि वितथ्यानि दर्शयस्व महाभुज ।

प्रकाशं कुरु चात्मानमप्रकाशञ्च मा० कुरु ॥

in which Viṣṇu tells Rudra to have the delusion—Sastra composed (by his devotee). and to reveal thereby anything and everything except His own intrinsic selfhood.

self except by means of devotion, and the results of his own meditation he published in the famous Govindāṣṭaka.

Whatever may we think, the philosophy of Religion revealed in the Bhāgavata texts was really in Śaṅkara's heart.

As to the extensive popularity of this sacred Purāṇa it will suffice here to say that in ages long gone by quite a good number of learned commentaries and expositions appeared, the most important of which are (1) the Tantra Bhāgavata, (2) Hanumad Bhāṣya, (3) Bāsanā Bhāṣya, (4) Sambandhokti, (5) Vidvat-Kāmadhenu, (6) Tattva-Dīpikā, (7) Mukta-phala, (8) Hari-Līlā, (9) Bhakti Ratnāvalī, (10) Bhābārtha-dīpikā, (11) Paramahamsapriyā (12) Śuka-hṛdaya. Of these many are now obsolete, but there is good reason to believe from the evidence of the Śaṭ-sandarbhā that they were available in the fifteenth century A. D. After the time of Śaṅkara and about the twelfth century A. D. the famous Vedāntist and great devotee Madhawāchārya even in his ripe old age brought out a learned commentary which is still now available. The exposition, again, upon which is based the religion in all its details practised by the present devotees of Bengal came from the pen of the well-known Goswāmis, Kūpa, Sanātana and Jīva, who are recognised as eternally released souls—the constant associates of Lord Gourāṅga in His Līlā; and also from the pen of Valadeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, the reputed author of the Govinda Bhāṣya, and of Viśwanātha Chakravartty who flourished perhaps in the 17th Century A. D.

The cumulative evidence of the above facts conclusively shows how the Bhāgavata Purāṇa contains within itself the essence of the contents of the four Vedas proper R̥k, Yajur, Sāman, and Atharva, as well as of the philosophy of the Vedānta system. And because this essence consists of super-

natural Bliss capable of being enjoyed by devotees from the stand point of any one of the five-fold personal relationships to the Absolute Lord Kṛṣṇa, the Purāṇa may be very well regarded as the representative of Kṛṣṇa Himself. So it has been rightly observed by the sage Vyāsa:—Kṛṣṇa the Absolute Lord having retired to his own realm along with Dharma and Knowledge (after having finished His manifest Līlā in the phenomenal world) this sun like Purāṇa (meaning the Bhāgavata) has appeared for the benefit of the beings of the Kali age who have lost their spiritual sight.¹

✓ Besides, in it are to be found in happy consonance all the threefold functions of the Vedas, the Purāṇas and the Kāvya viz, that in the capacity of a Veda it acts like some authoritative lord or master and teaches us religion in the shape of commandments and injunctions, in the capacity of a Purāṇa it teaches us like friends, while as a kāvya it serves the purpose of a well wishing better-half. For all these reasons, the Bhāgavata stands unrivalled in the whole sphere of Pramāṇas, and since Vaiṣṇavā Religion is entirely based upon it, we can explain the Philosophy of Vaiṣṇava Religion in no better way than by attempting an exposition of the philosophy taught by the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. N

Contents of the Bhāgavata indicated :—

We have already shown that in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa the Sage Vyāsa expressed in language what he had realised in deep meditation. The results of this realisation have been concisely stated in the following verses :—

भक्तियोगेन मनसि सम्यक् प्रणिहितेऽमले ।
अपश्यत् पुरुषं पूर्णं मायाञ्च नदपाश्रयाम् ॥
यया सम्मोहितो जीव आत्मानं त्रिगुणात्मकम् ।
परोऽपि मनुतेऽनर्थं तत्कृतञ्चाभिपद्यते ॥

1. The Sloka runs thus—कृष्णे स्वधामोपगते धर्मज्ञानादिभि सह ॥

कलौ नष्टशामेष पुराणार्कोऽधुनोदित ।

Bhag. I, 3, 43-44.

अनर्थोपशमं साक्षाद्भक्तियोगमधोद्वेजं ।
 लोकस्याजानतो व्यासश्चक्रे सात्वतसंहिताम् ॥
 यस्यां वै श्रयमाणायां कृष्णे परमपूरुषे ।
 भक्तिरुत्पद्यते पुंसः शोकमोहमलापहा ॥

I, 7, 4-7

The subtle principles (Tattwas) involved in these verses are the following—(1) the principle of the Absolute Being (Bhagavat-tattwa), (2) the principle of individual soul (Jiva-tattwa), (3) the principle of Māyā (Māyā tattwa), (4) (4) the principle of creation (Srsti-tattwa), (5) the principle of the means to be adopted for realisation of the Absolute Being (Abhidheya-Bhakti-Tattwa), (6) the principle of the end to be attained by realisation (Prayojana-Prema-Tattwa). The four Anubandhas or topics that have been stated at the beginning are included in these problems, viz that the first and second Anubandhas correspond to the first four principles herein stated, and the third and fourth anubandhas respectively correspond to the fifth and sixth principles. Let us take up one by one.

BOOK II.

Chapter I.

PROBLEM OF THE ABSOLUTE.

All history and our own experience tells us that belief in the Absolute Being is an inseparable characteristic of human mind. Implicitly or explicitly it rests in the mind—more accurately speaking—in the heart of all beings. Even the man who was at a time regarded as the greatest atheist in the world, it is said, cried out at the dying moment 'Lord save me'. Mr. Herbert Spencer, with what consistency he alone knows, attempts to combine with his pet theory of the

Relativity of Human Knowledge the assertion that "we are constrained to believe in the existence of the Absolute and that we can in a vague manner not amounting to positive thought have a certain consciousness of it". This belief in—this vague consciousness of—the Absolute is the starting point of all true religion. And because the Absolute Being is **अधोक्षज**, a thing which is beyond the ken of the senses, it must be regarded as intuitive. Indeed, as one of the greatest scientists of ancient Europe. Mr. Pascal, rightly observes, "the heart has reasons which reason does not know"; and intuitive belief means what this reason of the heart tells us. Nor should we argue that mere belief in or a vague consciousness of the Absolute Being is based upon the Scriptural texts. Had it been so, the argument would come to this—We believe in the Absolute because scriptures tell us to hold this belief, in other words, we believe in the Absolute because we believe in the Scriptures; and we believe in the scriptures because we believe in the Absolute whose direct revelation the scriptures are. Thus we arrive at a parallogism of pure reason or argument in a circle. To avoid this fallacy we cannot but admit the intuitive nature of the belief. Thus it is faith or intuition which is the legitimate and most primary organ of spiritual knowledge. Yet we cannot gainsay the fact of the inadequacy of intuition as a basis of certitude in religion. If faith is to guide us aright and make us advance in the path of religion, it must be made certain, strengthened on a broad sound basis, and deep rooted in our heart. This certitude and permanence of faith depends upon the following characteristics viz—

(a) that the concept of religious faith implies the conviction of a steadfastness, a certainty, an uninterrupted interconnexion in the fundamental relation between the individual soul and the Absolute self, however great may be the changes to

which the conditions of relative reality are subjected; in other words, faith is subjective continuity of disposition and will which seek to hold firmly to a objective continuity in existence; (b) that faith bears a close relation to will, for if an expression is to retain permanent validity there cannot but be a development of activity, and for the permanence of faith this activity of will consists in the holding fast to the idea of an end which has to be reached; (c) that confident boldness is an important element in faith, in other words, faith to be certain and permanent, must go paripassu with the knowledge 'that the Absolute is that where-at man provides himself with all good and finds a refuge in all needs', (d) that in faith an important part is played by the intellectual and æsthetic elements inasmuch as contemplative natures are bent on gaining a conception of the whole in the light of which the relation between the Absolute Self on the one hand and the individual soul and phenomenal world on the other shall be made clear; and finally (e) that in religious faith an important characteristic is determined by adherence to an example—an authority; faith is here an echo which is made possible by inner surrender to the example and so is based more upon the experience of others than upon direct independent personal experience.

These latent characteristics of faith, again, are made explicit and conspicuous if the intuitive faith be directed in consonance with the direct revelation of the Absolute Being Himself, i. e. with the Scriptures. The function of the Scriptures therefore in positing their authoritativeness is not to supply us with mere belief in the Absolute, but to teach us in detail the definite character of the concept of the Absolute and the practices to be followed for a complete realisation of such an Absolute. Accordingly, in the Supreme Scripture—the Bhāgavata Purāṇa—we find the following which our att-

rance about the definite character of the concept of the Absolute Reality viz :—

वदन्ति तत्तत्त्वविदस्तत्त्वं यद् ज्ञानमद्वयम् ।

ब्रह्मेति परमात्मेति भगवानिति शब्दयते ॥

(I, 2, 11).

Chapter II.

THE CONCEPT OF ADVAYA JÑĀNA TATTWA

In the first line of the above verse the ultimate Principle or Tattwa is described as Advaya Jñāna Tattwa, and the second line speaks of the three gradations of the same Reality viz as Brahman, Paramātmā and Bhagavān. On a careful—scrutiny it would appear that there are six concepts involved in the first line viz. Tattwa (तत्त्व), Jñāna (ज्ञान), Advaya (अद्वय), Advaya Tattwa (अद्वयतत्त्व), Advaya Jñāna (अद्वय-ज्ञान), and Advaya Jñāna Tattwa (अद्वयज्ञानतत्त्व); and the full significance of the last word which is the main concept here will be made out if we understand clearly the meaning of the first five terms; each of these therefore requires an elaborate examination.

To begin with the word Advaya. It has been thus defined by Jiva Goswāmī in the Tattwa Sandarbha p 37—“अद्वयत्वञ्चास्य स्वयंसिद्धतादृशानादृशनत्त्वान्तराभावान् स्वशक्त्येकसहायत्वात् परमाश्रयं तं विना तासामसिद्धत्वाच्च.” The word literally means ‘that which has got no second’. which again means ‘that equal to which there is no other thing’. Such a thing must be in the first place *swayamsiddha* or self-existent i. e. it exists by itself, it is the reason for the existence of all other things, and nothing whatsoever is necessary for its existence; in other words, the potency for its existence and subsistence lies within itself. Secondly, it must be such

that there is no other-thing of the same class or of a different class which is self-existent at the same time. To explain further—Difference manifests in three ways viz, (1) Difference when there is the sameness in respect of class (स्वजातीय भेद), e. g., two individual men though belonging to the same class of beings viz man might be different in many respects—age, sex etc.; similarly an individual soul is different from the Absolute soul though both come under the same category of chit—one being finite, the other Infinite. The concept of Advaya thus implies that if the ultimate Reality is Infinite Chit, it would exclude all individual beings from its own category. Furthermore, on account of the attribute of self-existence, if the Ultimate Reality is Kṛṣṇa it would exclude even Nārāyaṇa from the category, for, though both are Infinite, Kṛṣṇa is self-existent, while the existence of Nārāyaṇa, as will appear later on, depends upon Kṛṣṇa's existence. (2) Difference where there is difference also in respect of class, (विजातीय भेद) e. g., the phenomenal world, time, space etc. are different from the Absolute Soul—different in respect of class also; for while the Absolute is conscious and self-existent, the world etc. are unconscious and owe their existence to the Absolute. Thus the concept of Advaya implies that equal to the Absolute self there is nothing belonging to the class of the unconscious. (3) Difference between the thing-in-itself or essence and its body, as well as between the different parts or constituent limbs of the body (स्वगतभेद). In the case of a human being, for example, the underlying rational principle called soul is conscious and eternal while the organic body including the mind and the senses is unconscious and non-eternal being made up of the five elements that are unconscious and subject to decay; besides, there is difference between the different senses themselves—difference in respect of their respective functions:

the functions of the eye, for example, being never found to be performed by the ear or any other sense. The concept of Advaya implies that though the ultimate Reality is an embodied substance, yet there is no difference between the essence and the body, the ingredient being one and the same; it implies further that between the different parts of the body, between the different senses, there is no difference as will be made clear by and by.

The question now is 'Whether the Absolute is a formless substance as the monistic philosophers like Śaṅkara say, or an embodied substratum in which inhere endless auspicious qualities. The latter seems to be the true view, for there are lots of Scriptural texts on this point viz विज्ञानघन आनन्दघनः सच्चिदानन्दैकरसे भक्तियोगे तिष्ठति (Gop. Tāp. 79), विशुद्धविज्ञानघनं स्वसंस्थया समाप्तसर्वार्थममोघवाञ्छितम् । स्वनेजसा नित्यनिवृत्त-मायागुणप्रवाहं भगवन्तमीमहि ॥ (Bhāg.) स यथा सैन्धवघनोऽनन्तरोऽवाह्यः कृत्स्नो रसघन एवैवं.....कृत्स्नः प्रज्ञानघनःहोवाच याज्ञवल्क्य (Vrh. IV, 4, 13), इदं महद्भूतमनन्तमपारं विज्ञानघन एव.....अनुविनश्यति (Vrh. II, 4, 12), तदिदं पुण्डरीकं विज्ञानघनम् (Nār. Sūra), विज्ञानघन एवास्मि (Parama Skandha I) कारणरूपं बोधस्वरूपं विज्ञानघनम् (Ātm-āpra), अस्मात् सर्वस्मात् प्रियतम आनन्दघनो हि, स्वप्रकाशमानन्दघनम्, सद्घनोऽयं विज्ञानघन आनन्दघनः (all these three occurring in Nṛsiṃhottara-tāpanī), in which the word घन implies the idea of मूर्ति or body according to the sūtra of Panini मूर्तौ घनः. Hence all these texts clearly state that the Absolute Lord has knowledge and Bliss as His body. The same idea also occurs in the beginning verse of the Brahma Saṃhitā viz ईश्वरः परमः कृष्णः सच्चिदानन्दविग्रहः । अनादिरादिर्गोविन्दः

सर्वकारण कारणम् ॥, in which the word विग्रह means body and the Ultimate cause or Reality is described as one whose body consists of Existence, Knowledge and Bliss. In the texts again अपाणिपादो जवनो दहीता पश्याम्यचक्षुः स शृणोत्यकर्णः (Śvetā. 3, 19), and अपाणिपादोऽहमचिन्त्यशक्तिः पश्याम्यचक्षुः स शृणोत्यकर्णः (Kaiv. up. 2, 2) Brahman is apparently described as devoid of hand, foot, eye, ear etc: but the real significance of these texts is that the Absolute has got no limbs like ours which are made up of the five sensuous elements, but really possesses super-sensuous limbs of which the sole ingredient is bliss and consciousness; otherwise there would be no consistency with the previous texts सर्वतः पाणिपादं तत् सर्वतोऽक्षिशिरोमुखम् । सर्वतः श्रुतिमल्लोके सर्वमावृत्य तिष्ठति ॥ सर्वेन्द्रियगुणाभासं सर्वेन्द्रियविवर्जितम् । सर्वस्य प्रभुमीशानं सर्वस्य शरणं सुहृत् ॥ (Śvetā. III, 18 & 19) which mean that the Absolute possesses endless hands, feet, heads, faces, eyes and ears pervading throughout His body. Similarly in the same Upanisad the text न तस्य कार्यं करणञ्च विद्यते etc which apparently means that the Absolute has no senses (करण) is really to be understood in the sense that He has no gross senses like ours, but possesses supreme senses consisting entirely of bliss and knowledge, otherwise what follows viz परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते etc would be quite unmeaning and inconsistent (this text means that His powers are endless including of course the powers of the senses).

As regards the fact that there is no Swagatabheda in the Absolute, we might state that since He is described in the Śruti as Satya, Jīva and Ānanda, evidently there is no difference in His case between the 'Thing-in-itself' and the body—both being consciousness etc. Besides, each sense organ and organ of action of the Absolute simultaneously performs the function of itself as well as of each of the others, and

this appears from the texts—सर्वतः पाणिपादं तत् etc. cited above and अङ्गानि यस्य सकलेन्द्रियवृत्तिमन्ति पश्यन्ति.....(Brahma-Samhitā V, 32). In this respect of nondifference between the essence and body as well as between the different limbs of the body, the Absolute is completely differentiated from other beings—phenomenal world and individual self, and thereby the term Advaya most appropriately applies to the Absolute.

Next the word ज्ञान is being explained. Jeyva Goswami explains ज्ञान as चिदेकरूपम् ('Tattvā Sandarbha p.37) i. e. 'that of which Chit is the only Rūpa': Rūpa again means 'that whereby a thing shines beautifully'. Thus Jñāna means—that consciousness which shines on account of Chit which means Ego or Self. So we see that consciousness is an attribute which shines only on account of the existence of Ego or Self. This is the ordinary view which holds good in the case of created beings, and this view evidently takes cognisance of a difference between the Ego and the consciousness—the difference being due to the fact that consciousness in such cases depends upon something else besides the Ego viz, the senses and the body. But when standing apart from the body and the senses, consciousness is selfluminous, i.e. shines not on account of something else but by itself. And this self-luminosity is possible only if to Jñāna be appended the character of selfexistence and the absence of Swagatabheda: in other words, consciousness is selfluminous if Jñāna is Advaya.

Again the word Jñāna here is also to be regarded as one possessing consciousness on the ground of its derivation from the base Jñāna with the suffix अच् by rule अश् आदिभ्य अच्. From this, as well as from the fact already explained, viz that the Absolute is an embodied thing, it appears that the

Absolute is an Ego or substance in which inheres the attribute of consciousness which consciousness is self-luminous, whose body consists of the ingredient of consciousness, which is self-existent depending upon its own potency, equal to which there is no other thing of the same class or of a different class and which is therefore the only primeval source of the origination and existence of all other things.

But, as we know from various scriptural texts viz **आनन्दो ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात्** (Taitt. III, 6), **सत्यं ज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म** (Taitt. II, 1, 1), **विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म** (Brih. III, 9, 28), **आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान् न विभेति कुतश्चन** (Taitt. II, 4, 1), the Absolute consists not only of Infinite Knowledge but also of Infinite Bliss, and to keep up the reconciliation of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa with all the scriptures we must anyhow show that the concept of Bliss is alike involved in the proposition stated in the verse cited. To this end however we cannot say that mere knowledge necessarily involves the element of pleasure; for, had it been so, the explanation of Jñāna as **चिदेकरूपम्** would have no significance; besides it is not warranted by our experience. Nor can we say so on the basis of the text **सत्तास्वानन्दयोर्योगात् चित् परं ब्रह्म चोच्यते** (Brhat Goutamiya Tantra). For in that text the fifth case-ending in **योगात्** is either **हेतौ** or **ल्यबलोपे**; in either case, the meaning of the text is that Chit alone is not called **परब्रह्म** (Ultimate Reality), but something else viz conjunction of Existence and Bliss is necessary for the conception of the Absolute. From this it never follows, unless it is a forced meaning, that in Chit are necessarily involved the elements of Existence or Bliss. Although thus mere consciousness cannot be said to involve the concept of Bliss, yet we cannot but admit that consciousness which is Advaya in the sense already stated, that is to

say, knowledge in the state of the highest development necessarily involves the concept of Bliss. In ordinary life also we see how an individual attains development not in all kinds of knowledge but in that or those in which he takes interest or delight; in other words, pleasure is inseparably connected with knowledge the more as the latter gets developed. The term Advaya Jñāna therefore really implies the attributes of Existence, Knowledge and Bliss (Satchidānanda).

That the Absolute according to the Bhāgavata Cult consists of Infinite Bliss appears also from the word Tattwa occurring in the verse. The word तत्त्व in Samskr̥t means, amongst other things, Sāra (सार) or the most essential thing; and the most essential thing is that to which the mind is the most inclined. Again, it is pleasure towards which all mental activities are naturally and preeminently directed. Thus the word Tattwa really means pleasure or bliss. Philosophers might differ about the definite character of this pleasure, but this is an undoubted fact that they all directly or indirectly describe good or pleasure as the end to be attained. If this bliss be Advaya or non-parc̥il, it is called the real and highest end which ought to be attained. The Absolute is thus constituted of Infinite Bliss—the Highest good to be attained.

Again, the presence of these attributes necessarily implies that the Absolute has got potencies for them. Of these endless Śāktis, those constituting the Parā or Swarūpa Śakti, i. e. the intrinsic self-hood of the Absolute (cf. परास्य शक्ति विविच्य थूयते.....Svet. VI, 8) have been classified in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa into three Viz, Sandhinī, Samvit, and Hlādinī which are the same as Sat, Chit and Ānanda. These three Śāktis can be briefly defined thus—That whereby

the ever-existent Being holds up His own existence as well as grants to individual souls and the phenomenal world the power of existence is called the Sandhinī Śakti. It is owing to this potency that the Absolute is called the root of the existence of the Universe, and in this sense He is described as the Ultimate Reality whereas the world and individual Soul as relative Reality. Secondly the potency whereby the Absolute Truth and Consciousness manifests Himself as Omniscient and also makes others possessed of knowledge is called the Saṁvit Śakti. In this sense it is that in the Bhagavata Gītā the Absolute Kṛṣṇa is described as the Āchāryya or Preceptor of all beings. Lastly, the potency whereby the Absolute is constituted of the attribute of Infinite Bliss, as well as grants to beings unspeakable pure bliss by way of acceptance of their servitude is called the Hlādinī Śakti. It is only a very small bit of this Infinite Bliss of the Absolute (कर्णशिका कापि कापि as Kṛṣṇa Karmā-mṛta says) that is capable of contributing to the total amount of supreme pleasure to be enjoyed by the beings of the Universe (cf. एषोऽस्य परम आनन्दः, एतस्यैवानन्दस्यान्यानि मृतानि मात्रामुर-जीवन्ति—Bṛih. IV, 3, 32).

Śaktis or Energies are twofold—potential and Kinetic. These are but two aspects or stages of one and the same force. The Kinetic character consists in the actual production of effects, and herein lies the speciality and preeminence of a force. One might possess the power of making jars and the like, but the mere possession of the power in a potential state does not make him conspicuous and valued in the estimation of others—nay it counts for nothing, so long as it is not applied to a lump of clay, and, thereby bringing about certain changes, it does not give it a definite shape etc. Although however abstraction and concreteness

1. See appendix.

are—interrelated, yet the superiority of the latter cannot be ignored and in the development of philosophic thought in the west this was clearly made out by the Dialectic Reasoning of Hegel.

This twofold aspect holds equally good in the case of the Absolute. His three Śaktis mentioned above have eternally and simultaneously got the two stages—potential and Kinetic. The stage in which the Śaktis are potential we might describe as Nirviśeṣa state of the Absolute, which is the same as the conception of Brahman according to the School of Śaṅkara. Leaving aside this point for a fuller treatment later on, we might state for the present that the highest stage of the Absolute—the state of Kṛṣṇaism according to Vaiṣṇava Philosophy—consists in the actualisation of the three Śaktis and herein lies the Absolute Lordship or Bhagavattā (भगवत्ता) of the Absolute. One of the concrete effects of the Śaktis is evidently the embodiment or eternal assumption of a particular shape. And to be consistent with the conception of Perfection in the Absolute we cannot but admit that the Absolute, as contradistinguished from the theory of Non-differenced Substance, is the Highest Person having a peculiar body of His own made up of the sole ingredient of Reality, Knowledge and Bliss. This point as has been shown, is corroborated by various Scriptural texts e. g. विज्ञानानन्दघनः, सच्चिदानन्दविग्रहः etc. which
 ✧ unmistakably prove that the Absolute has a body.

Although the three Parā Śaktis are eternally collateral attributes of the Absolute, yet there is a peculiar relation between them. Without entering at present into a detailed examination of this point we might briefly indicate here that
 ✧ of the three Śaktis Sandhinī, Samvit and Hlādinī each succeed-

ing one includes and supersedes the preceding. The Hladini Śakti therefore involves the two others and yet transcends them. Indeed the excellence of the Bhakti Cult lies in the fact that though it does not exclude the concept of knowledge in the Absolute, yet it lays special stress upon the attribute of Bliss, and this doctrine about the allinclusive allsurpassing importance of Bliss is the more tenable because the best theory of creation, as will be elucidated later on, is possible only from the point of view of the bliss attribute of the Absolute. Thus we find that the Absolute Lordship of Bhagavān is preeminently connected with Bliss and with a view to this very point the Scriptures describe the Absolute as Rasa (रसो वै स रसं ह्येवायं लब्ध्वानन्दी भवति Taitt. II, 7) From the detailed examination of this text that will follow later on, it is quite evident that the Absolute Lord is in eternal enjoyment of Bliss or sportive pastime as it is called. As evidenced by our own experience, sportive pastime is not practicable without associates. It must be admitted therefore that the Lord enjoys eternal sportive joy in the company of associates—these latter being of different grades as will be shown hereafter.

✓ The theory laid down about the associates of the Absolute Lord in His eternal Līlā or sports can also be explained by reference to the Scriptural text सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत् एकमेवाद्वितीयम् Chhā. VI, 2, 1 “Reality, if alone there was in the beginning (meaning of course after the great Dissolution) One without a second”. The One Reality again is described in Text as the Highest Person, the Lord of all. Ordinarily we find that even an earthly king never remains singly or alone; for be it said of the public capacity, even in his private capacity the king always resides in the company of his intimate associates, if not of any officials. Similarly

it must be said that after each great dissolution in the eternal cycle of creation there may not be any vestige of actual creation (अद्वितीयम्)—the creative power might be in the potential state, but the Absolute Lord is there ever dwelling in His own divine heaven, always in the enjoyment of sportive pastime attended by His constant beatific associates.

The theory about the Absolute Lord having a peculiar dress, decoration etc, and a transcendently supreme residence of His own follows as a corollary from what is stated above. It will thus be clear how one apt phrase अद्वयज्ञान-तरङ्ग reveals such an astonishingly great volume of truths, and with what admirable subtlety the Vaiṣṇava Philosophers care to analyse each word used in the texts so as to find out the real meaning that otherwise lies hidden to seekers after truth. The full significance of the expression Advaya Jñāna Tattva may now be consummated as follows :—

The Absolute Lord that consists of endless auspicious qualities, whose Śaktis or potencies though endless in number, for a clear conception to be made out to the inquisitive, are broadly classified into three classes—Sandhinī, Samvit and Hlādinī; equal to whom there is no other thing of the same or different category. in whom there is no difference between the self and the body, between the different elements of the body; who is self-existent, who Himself is Truth, consciousness and Bliss and whose body is made up of the same supreme ingredients of Truth, Consciousness and Bliss; who is preeminently bliss¹ and the inexhaustible source of all

-
1. This doctrine about the preeminence of the Bliss attribute in the Absolute, supported by various scriptural texts, follows from the very wording of the Bhagavata Sloka. Rendered into English the first line of the verse stands thus—

bliss that is to be found in the Universe; who is the greatest summumbonnum so to say reconciling and yet transcending within Himself all other summumbonnums conceived by other systems of Religion; who possesses a peculiar divine shape, dress, adornments and the like; who is eternally in the midst of ecstatic joy in the company of His own intimate associates; who is adored by all—even by those ascetics the fetters of whose Karman have been rent asunder; of whom Brahman and Paramātmā are but partial aspects—this Absolute Lord is what is signified by the Phrase Advaya Jñāna Tattwa

Chapter III.

THE CONCEPT OF BHAGAVĀN.

(From the second line of the verse it is quite clear that one and the same principle of Advaya Jñāna Tattwa is differently manifested according to difference in the degree of realisation, and styled differently as Brahman, Paramātmā and Bhagvān) and never as Jīva or individual soul. The term Brahman here is to be understood not in the sense of Brahman or ultimate Reality which the expounder of the

‘Knowers of truth and Realisers of Bliss describe that as Tattwa which Tattwa (bliss) is Advaya Jñāna’. The logical proposition stated here is ‘(which) Tattwa is Advaya Jñāna’, and on the basis of the text अनुवादमनुक्त्वा तु न विदेयमुदीरयेत् । न ह्यलङ्घ्यास्पदं किञ्चित् कुत्रचित् प्रतिनिष्ठम् ॥

(Kavya Prakāśa) the word Tattwa stated first is evidently the Anuvādi or subject, and Advaya Jñāna the Vidheya or predicate term. From the respective significances of the two terms Anuvādi and Vidheya viz that the Anuvādi word stands like a substratum for the predicate to inhere in, some sort of pre-eminence is no doubt given to the word Tattwa in the text.

Brahman Sūtra had in view, but in the sense of Brahman as understood by the followers of the theory of Abstract Monism i. e. Brahman as a Non-differenced Substance as Śaṅkara puts it. To avoid confusion, and for the sake of accuracy, Vaiṣṇava Philosophy uses the term Para Brahman and identifies it with the Ultimate Reality or the principle of Bhagavān. To understand clearly the course and development of philosophic thought in the sphere of Hindu Religion, with special reference to the height of reflection and realisation which the authors of Vaiṣṇava Philosophy—the constant associates and adherents of Lord Jīvaśrī had reached, it is necessary therefore to explain in sufficient detail the meaning of the three technical terms. Our next attempt therefore is to give an exposition of the concept of Bhagavān.

In the Bhāgavata Cult Bhagavān means the ultimate Reality or Advaya Tattva. All the characteristics, therefore, of the Advaya Jñāna mentioned above apply to this concept.

To explain more clearly and elaborately we might refer in the first place to the Viṣṇu Purāṇa texts cited in the Bhag. Sandarbha, p. 50, Viz—यत्तदव्यक्कमजग्मचिन्त्यमजमक्षयम् । अनिर्देश्यमरूपञ्च पाणिपदाद्यसंयुतम् ॥ विभुं सर्वगतं नित्यं भूतयेतिमकारणम् । व्याप्यव्याथं यत सर्व्वं तद् वै पश्यन्ति सूर्य ॥ तद् ब्रह्म परमं धाम तद् ध्येयं मोक्षकांक्षिणाम् । श्रुतिवाक्योदितं मूढं तद् विष्णोः परमं पदम् ॥ तदेतद् भगवद् वाच्यं स्वरूपं परमात्मनः । वाचको भगवच्छब्दस्तस्याद्यस्याक्षरात्मनः ॥ (VI, 5, 66-69). "That which is the subject matter of all the Upanisads and other scriptural texts, which is non-manifest (to the gross-senses), devoid of old age, infirmity, inconceivable, not born, not decaying, not capable of being pointed out (by way of reference to any perceptible object), not having any (gross) form, not endowed with hands feet etc. (earthly limbs), capable of doing anything at His will, entering into anything,"

and everything of the Universe, eternal, the source of all
brings, Uncaused, all-pervading, not pervaded by anything else,
which is the highest and most excellent abode, which is to be
devoted to and worshipped by all desirous of release, which
is the manifestor of Paramātmā, the halo of whose bodily
lustre is what the Monistic theory describes as Brahman—
that is called Bhagavān. A little below the above texts in
the same Purāṇa we find the meaning of the constituent
letters (Bha, ga, Va) of the word thus stated—

भर्ता भकारेऽर्थद्वयान्वितः । नेता गमयिता स्रष्टा गकारार्थस्तथा मुने ॥

वसन्ति तत्र भूतानि अखिलात्मनि स च भूतेष्वेतेषु

वकारार्थस्ततोऽव्ययः ॥ (cited in the Bhag. Sandarbha, p. 50) The
letter 'Bha' signifies the idea of sustaining and aggravating
the real and natural devotional function in His own devotees,
as well as of sustaining the whole universe in general; the letter
'ga' indicates that He by His own grace makes his devotees
attain the Summumbonum called Premānanda as well as the
supersensuous heaven-trio—the abol. of Himself; the letter
'va' implies that all beings ultimately lie with Him and He
lies within all beings in the capacity of His own partial as-
pect—Paramātmā. The term 'Bhaga' again implies the idea
of eternal potency sufficient to conquer all beings, eternal
influence (similar to the influence of incantations and medi-
cinal gems that we find working in the phenomenal world),
eternal fame for possessing all qualities of the mind, body and
speech, eternal prosperity of infinite varieties, Omniscience,
eternal non-affection by things of the phenomenal world
(cf. ऐश्वर्यं स्य समग्रस्य चैर्यस्य यशसः त्रिद ॥

ज्ञानवैराग्ययोश्चैव पण्णां भग इतीक्ष्णा ॥—

Vishnu

VI, 5 cited in the Bhag. Sandarbha, p. 51). There is a distinct
statement further that in Bhagavān exist only those sixfold

lordliness without the slightest tinge of any gross quality such as is to be found in the phenomenal world (cf. ज्ञानशक्ति-
लैश्वर्यवीर्यतेजांस्यशोषतः । भगवच्छब्दवाच्यानि विना ह्यैर्गुणा-
दिभिः ॥—Visnu. VI, 5, cited in the Bhag. Sandarbha, p. 51).

On a careful examination of these lines as well as of what preceded in explanation of the word Advaya Jñāna Tattwa, we can arrive at some of the important characteristics of the concept of Bhagavān. The most important one—that which is the distinctive feature of Vaiṣṇava Philosophic thought is, as we have proved by lots of Śruti texts, that the Ultimate Reality has a form and body of its own. This form is that of a human being as appears from the text—यन्मर्त्यलीलौपायिकं दधद्वपुः
.....भूषणभूषणङ्गम् (Bhāg. III, 2, 12), मायामनुष्यभावेन गूढै-
श्वर्ये परेऽप्यये.....सर्वात्मनीश्वरे (Bhāg. XI, 6, 49), गूढं परं
ब्रह्म मनुष्यलिङ्गम् (Bhāg. VII. 15, 75, “Para Brahman is a much concealed form consisting of the sign of a human being”),
अव्यक्तं मर्त्यलिङ्गमधोत्तमम् (Bhāg. X, 9, 14), भगवान् गूढः कपट-
मानुषः (Bhāg. I, 1, 20), यत्रावतीर्णं कृष्णाख्यं परं ब्रह्म नराकृति—
“There appeared the Absolute Being Kṛṣṇa whose form is similar to that of a human being” (Visnu. V), एवं मनुष्य-
पदवीमनुवर्त्तमानो नारायणः..... गृहीतशक्तिः (Bhāg. X, 69, 44).
The Gopāla Tāpanī Śruti also says that Para Brahman is of the shape of a cowherd (गोपवेशमभ्रमं तरुणं कल्पद्रुमाश्रितम्—Gopā-
la Pūrva Tāpanī 12). It is to be noted here that the theory about the Absolute having a body, which is so clearly developed in Vaiṣṇava Philosophy is also indirectly hinted at in other systems of Religion. The Christian Doctrine, for example, while stating about the Throne of God, undoubtedly accepts this theory though not explicitly. In the Islamic Religion again we find an indication about the embodiedness of the Absolute inas-much as Hazrat Mūsā even after realising the halo of

divine lustre could not rest satisfied but longed after a further realisation, and, it is said, was subsequently favoured with a sight of the Lord somewhere towards the slope of a mountain, and forthwith became unconscious and fell into a swoon owing to the ecstatic joy he felt. The theory about the human form, however, is *clearly* established in the Bhāgavata Cult alone, and we have reasons to accept this. Does not the Christian theory, while telling us that God created man in His own image, indirectly accept the same view? Irrespective of any biased commentary, the very word 'image' taken in its literal sense implies that God with the Christians also is of human form—that He is the Ideal man whose true prototypes are the individual men of the world. The only difference is that the view is explicitly stated and elaborated in the Vaiṣṇava System, whereas it is tacitly assumed or implicitly stated in the Christian Theory. Again, from this very fact as well as from the statement that our bodies are the temples of His Holy Spirit it is also evident that the Christian Theory sets before us a human life as the fullest expression and revelation of the nature and life of God. Probably this might also be the view of the Vaiṣṇava Religious system in asserting that the form of the body of the Absolute is similar to that of the human body. Although it is a fact that, so long as the Jiva or individual soul is lying encased in a body subtle or gross, there is no hope of any religious realisation, yet because of the theory of eternal cycle of creation and of the doctrine of Transmigration of Soul we cannot but admit ^{nor} that our soul resides in some form of body and we must begin our religious life in that very state—call it bondage or whatever else you like; and of all the varieties of bodily forms, our own experience tells us that the form of a human body is the best suited for its controlling principle—the soul to entertain an inquisitiveness

into the knowledge of the Absolute and to that end to adopt all possible means for throwing off the shackles of sensuous matter. One fundamental dogma common to all religious theories is that it is preeminently by self-resignation that we can aspire after reaching the kingdom of God, and this divine attribute is no where to be found in the same degree as in a human being—not even amongst deities who, being devoid of infirmity and consequently never losing the powers of their sense organs, are seldom expected to be averse to temporal enjoyments.

To this doctrine about the Absolute having a definite form and body it might be objected that thereby the Absolute Being is reduced to a limited object. To that our reply is that though the Absolute has a definite form, yet He has the powers of assuming any form at any time at his own sweet will, and actually contains within Himself endless forms and bodies in a subtle state. In other words, He is eternally limited and unlimited at one and the same time. All contradictions merge in him, and conflicting attributes exist in Him in a friendly way as it were. Herein lies the inconceivability of His power, and hereby he is described as a Being absolutely different from any other being. Moreover, if He is limited, He is self-determined; and self-determination is no where to be found in the things of the universe. It is to be distinctly noted in this connection that the similarity between the body of the Absolute and a human body is in respect of form only and not of the ingredient. While a human body is made up of sensuous matter, the body of the Absolute consists solely of the supersensuous. The Absolute is Satchidānanda, or the three supersensuous elements of Reality, Knowledge and Bliss constitute His body.

As regards the potencies of the Absolute we have already indicated that the Absolute possesses Infinite powers which

have been classified by Vaiṣṇava Philosophy into three classes¹ viz (a) Swarūpa or Parā Śakti, (b) Tatāsthā or Jīva Śakti and (c) Vahirāṅgā or Māyā Śakti. These three Śaktis are also styled in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa as Viṣṇu Śakti, Ksetrajñā or Ajāra Śakti, and Avidyā Śakti. To explain by way of analogy—just as the luminous substance of the sun appears as (1) the solar disc, (2) the individual rays and (3) the reflection, so the inconceivable power of the Absolute manifests in these three ways. The Jīva Śaktis correspond to the individual rays, and the Māyā Śakti to the reflection. The sun contains within itself the individual rays, yet the latter is found to be scattered and away from the receptacle of the disc: similarly, Jīva Śaktis though ultimately contained within the same eternal reservoir Bhagavān (inasmuch as the Jīvas are parts of Bhagavān as the displayer of the Jīva Śakti, having finite existence, finite knowledge and finite bliss) by reason of beginningless Karma, are scattered away from the original source. To explain further—Just as the individual rays having deviated away from the sun get their normal aspect suppressed by the reflexion-force, which means that the individual rays, though intrinsically of the same character, by reason of reflexion through the medium of ether primarily and manifold objects secondarily, appear to be manifest in diverse ways; similarly, the natural function of Jīvas is to exist with the Infinite Existent, to know the Omniscient and to enjoy the Infinite Bliss; and for the transgression of deviation away the Māyā Śakti suppresses them by way of showing a diversity, which means that the same natural function common to all Jīvas lies hidden under the cover of manifold miseries. It is clear, therefore, that the Jīva Śaktis or individual souls from beginningless time come within the clutches of Māyā Śakti (excep-

1. See Appendix.

tion being in the case of eternally—released souls).

The concept of Bhagavān thus implies that in this the highest stage there is a display of the Swarūpa Śaktis: and though Bhagavān is the original substratum of the Māyā Śakti, yet owing to the inconceivability underlying the Swarūpa Śaktis He is not in the least affected by the effects of the Māyā Śakti: in other words, just as a snake shakes off its outer skin thinking it to be of no use, so Bhagavān shakes off Māyā thinking that, of lordliness eternally and infinitely attained as He is, He has nothing to do with that useless Śakti¹. If it be reargued—why is it that Bhagavān does not display the other two kinds of Śakti? The answer is this—He does it but not directly. The Chairman of a municipality directly exercises some functions and dedicates certain powers to some officers who in their turn are ultimately responsible to the Chairman. He is directly indifferent to the exercise of functions by the officers, and yet it is the fact that all functions lie concentrated in the function of the Chairman. Similarly, Bhagavān manifests the other powers not directly, but indirectly through the medium of His own partial manifest Paramātmā and He remains indifferent to the doings of Paramātmā—indifferent because in consequence of the display of vahirangā sakti by Paramātmā there arises an effect, viz, creation, which however depends upon something foreign i. e. beginningless Karman done by Jīvas in previous existences. Because the doctrine of Karman—the doctrine, to be clear, of the totality of acts (alien to the Swarūpa Śakti) done in previous existences from beginningless time appears in the forefront as a foreign element, therefore Bhagavān remains indifferent. This indifference explains the one supreme attribute of Bhagavān which consists in impartial benevolence towards all beings.

1. See Appendix

As already pointed out the Swarūpa Śaktis of Bhagavān are classified into three kinds viz—(a) Sandhinī, (b) Samvit and (c) Hladinī. These threefold Śaktis constituting the very self of the Absolute are, like the solar disc, the concentrated form of the endless forces that like radiating rays act in the whole universe consisting of individual souls and phenomenal worlds. So it is said in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa — “Just as of a fire placed on a spot the lustre radiates and spreads in manifold directions, so the universe existing in manifold names and forms is but the scattering forces issuing out of unlimited reservoir of forces, i. e. of Para Brahman”.¹

The Śruti also says तस्य भासा सर्वमिदं विभक्ति (Śveta. V, 14) i. e. Para Brahman is a selfluminous substance whose light of forces illumines or manifests the whole universe. This endless storehouse of Śaktis is eternally concentrated and eternally radiating. Concentration and radiation are eternally going on simultaneously, and such reconciliation of contradictories, nowhere else to be observed, is possible only because of the inconceivability of the power of Bhagavān, and inconceivability consists in nothing but the capacity for effectuating what is otherwise and elsewhere impracticable.

With this inconceivability (अन्वित्य शक्ति) of Bhagavān Vaisnava Philosophy establishes an inseparable connection of the fact that in Him the fullest development of the sixfold lordliness is eternally attained. These six lordlinesses have already been explained as infinite power of controlling all, infinite power for doing things that like the effects of medicinal herbs and gems etc look like miracles, infinite good name, infinite splendour, omniscience, and eternal unattachment to the effects of Mayā. The

1. See Appendix.

display of these 'lordlinesses' is made by Bhagavān in many ways; and the stage which is the object of worship and meditation according to the Bhāgavata Cult is that in which even in the display of lordliness there is always a graceful charm (Mādhuryya bhagavattāsāra, Charitāmṛta). Lordliness is also displayed by what Rāmānuja describes as Nārāyaṇa—the Absolute in the supersensuous heaven called Vaikunṭha, but this is not the highest object of devotion according to the view of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism which says that ecstatic bliss or the greatest summumbonum consists in devotion to that stage of the Absolute whose display of lordliness is always guided by a graceful charm.

The three Śaktis—their gradation :

In the elaboration of the meaning of Advaya Jñāna Tattva it was already pointed out how the Bhāgavata Cult, while recognising that the three Swarūpa Śaktis are eternally co-inhering in the Absolute Being Bhagavān, gives some sort of prominence to the Hlādinī Śakti. The concept of this Hlādinī Śakti necessarily involves those of Reality and Knowledge. Instead of, therefore, saying that the Absolute as Bhagavān revels in the eternal manifestation of the three Swarūpa Śaktis, we should better say that He revels in Hlādinī Śakti, the more because by such statement the prominence attached to this Śakti would be clearly made out. This very idea is clearly stated in the Bhāgavatā text—

त्वमाद्यः पुरुषः साक्षादश्वरः प्रकृतेः परः ।
मायां व्युदस्य चिच्छुस्त्या कैवल्ये स्थित आत्मनि ॥—I, 7, 23,

“You are the ultimate embodied Reality i. e. Bhagavān, lying in a realm far beyond the region of Māyā i. e. not in the least affected by the effects of Māyā on account of your own

Chit Śakti¹ (here indicating all the three Śaktis combined), and you are eternally lying in your own fullest realisation of your own Bliss". According to the conception of the Swarūpaśakti already indicated this Hlādinī Śakti must be understood here to be in the state of eternally concentrated form, and because concentrated therefore having a shape or body, just in the same way as water concentrated assumes a definite shape called ice. And so the Upanisad texts unambiguously state—“आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो रूपम्” “Bliss is the form of the Absolute” ‘विज्ञानघनः आनन्दघनः.....तिष्ठति” where the word घन clearly implies the idea of concentration as well as embodiedness.

The same Ultimate Reality or Supreme Being is described elsewhere in the Upanisad text as “रसो वै सः.....आनन्दी भवति”. The idea contained in this text is the most vital point in the system of Vaiṣṇava Philosophy; of the many central ideas it serves as the pivot upon which the whole theory about the concept of Bhagavān hinges. It is necessary, therefore, to enter into a detailed examination of this text.

The first question that arises here is—“What is it that the term Rasa signifies? Is Rasa a substance or an attribute”? In all the Natural Sciences it is clearly described as an attribute. Thus in the Charaka Saṃhitā we find ‘रस-
नार्थो रसस्तस्य द्रव्यमापः क्षितिस्तथा’ (Sūtrāsthāna, ch. I, 51)
“Rasa is that which is the object of the sense of taste, its substance is water and earth; hence it is clearly described as an attribute. Again, elsewhere in the same Saṃhitā we find

1. Although accurately speaking ‘Chit’ means the Samvit Śakti which is but one of the three svarūpa Śaktis, yet in the Bhagavata as also in the authoritative treatises on Bengal Vaiṣṇavism (the Kāṣṭha lārha included) we find the word often used in the sense of the three svarūpa Śaktis combined

“क्षरात् क्षारो नासौ रसः द्रव्यं तत्” “Ksāra is not Rasa because it is a substance i. e. Rasa is not a substance but an attribute”. And this follows from the distinctive meaning of the two terms substance and attribute, viz, that a substance is that in which Karma (कर्म) and attribute co-inhere, and which by itself on account of the Samavāya (समवाय) relation produces an act, whereas an attribute is that which by way of its inhering in a substance makes the Samavāya relation posited and which itself has no act (यत्राश्रिताः कर्मगुणा कारणं समवायि यत् । तद् द्रव्यं समवायी तु निश्चेष्टः कारणं गुणः ॥ P. 26, Charaka Saṃhitā, Harinātha Viśārada's edition). The term Rasa therefore implies that attribute of a substance which is perceived by us by means of our sense of taste; and this perception arises in six different ways—hence the science of Ayurveda recognises six rasas. One thing however is common to all these six rasas viz pleasurable as the after effect. That sweet is pleasurable is admitted by all; bitter, sour and other rasas also are pleasurable in-as-much as, if properly applied, they do good to the bodily system. Sweet again is not always pleasurable, but under certain restrictions. So is the case with the remaining five. Briefly speaking, pleasurable arises as an after effect but subject to certain restrictions.

In the spheres of Poetry and Music, again, the term Rasa has an allied significance. Poetry is defined by rhetoricians as a collocation of words of which the essence is rasa (रसः त्वं वाक्यं काव्यम्—Kāvya Prakāśa). Music also is similarly defined. There is similarity as well as difference between these two—similarity because in both the existence of rasa produces pleasure, difference because the pleasure arises in the two cases in different ways.

Thus to all the three rasas as defined in Physical Science, in Poetry and in Music one thing is common, viz, pleasurable-ness. Now we arrive at a suitable definition of rasa viz "that it is an attribute whereby our rational principle feels pleasure". The next question is 'Is Rasa an attribute inhering in a substance lying outside our selves'? Philosophers of the Sensational School like Locke, Hume and others would at once say 'No.' Leaving aside a discussion of their theory, we, believing in the theory of things-in-themselves, should say that Rasa is an attribute inhering in a substance outside our selves, and it is an attribute whereby pleasure is felt. The quality of the pleasure varies no doubt, but this variation depends upon some other condition or conditions.

The pleasure however which is produced by the Rasa as defined above is a finite and transient one for the simple reason that the attribute itself is a finite one and the conditions are not permanent. If now we substitute the words Infinite and Eternal, we should define Rasa as that Infinite attribute whereby Infinite and Eternal pleasure is felt.¹ This infinite attribute can belong only to Bhagavān—the Absolute. Thus Rasa is nothing but the Hlādinī Śakti explained before. And because in the Absolute there is the relation of difference and non-difference between substance and attribute, between self and body, therefore the Absolute Himself also is styled Rasa or Rasaghana (रसघनः) in the scriptural texts. In other words, Rasa is the ingredient of the body of the Absolute, Rasa is His attribute, and He Himself is Rasa. Again, the Infinite pleasure is felt by whom? Surely by the Infinite Self; therefore the Absolute as Bhagavān is also called the enjoyer of Bliss. He is Rasika, nay, He is the transcendental Rasika because of the full-

1. See Appendix.

est realisation of the bliss.

Turning next our attention to the derivation of the word we would arrive at a deeper meaning. The term *Rasa* in Sanskrit is derived from root *रस्* (to enjoy) by the addition of the suffix *अप्* in *कर्मवाच्य* or *भाववाच्य*, also from causative *रस्* with the suffix in *कर्तृ वाच्य*. When in *कर्मवाच्य* the word *रस* would mean the Being (Highest Self) that is to be enjoyed (*रस्यते आस्वाद्यते असौ इति रसः*) —the object of enjoying, hence the Substance; i. e.—Brahman (*सः* in *रसौ वै सः*) in which inheres bliss, and this indicates the stage in which the individual soul has got a desire for attaining Bliss by way of self-realisation but not has actually attained it. When in *भाववाच्य* the word would mean the act of enjoying bliss, and the sentence *रसौ वै सः* would mean 'He (Brahman) is the act of enjoying bliss'. But here comes the anomaly 'How could the Absolute Being, who is decidedly a substance, be an act?' The anomaly, however, can be explained away by the fact that when a being, the subject of the act of devotion, by way of realisation attains the state of very great buoyancy in ecstatic bliss, he would be in the midst of such an uninterrupted flow of enjoyment that his attention towards the object of Bliss would be temporarily suspended as it were. This stage of supersensuous emotional feeling has indeed no parallel in the world's history of religious feeling and cannot be adequately described in words. Yet, somehow to give an idea, we might venture to say that to this stage may be regarded as somewhat similar the stage of spiritual exaltation or ecstasy—the final goal of Neo-Platonism's speculation; but, while with the Neo-Platonists in their utter

zeal for a purely monistic conception the state of ecstasy is described as 'that in which the last distinction of subject and object vanishes and thought dies away into feeling and the finite spirit in its striving beyond itself is lost in God', the dualistic theory—more accurately speaking, the Achintya Bhedābheda theory—of the Vedānta, on the other hand, consistently with its own doctrine recognises only a temporary suspension of the distinction between subject and object. Such suspension again takes place only at the stage in which the bliss enjoyed by the ideal devotee like Rādhā attains the highest development called Mahābhāva. It is this very point which is referred to in the Charitāmṛta Text-

Pahilahi rāga nayanabhaṅga bhela

Anudina vāḍhala—avadhi nā gela.

Nā so ramana, nā hām ramāṇī.

Duhunana manobhava peśala jāni.

(Chap, VIII, Madhya Līlā).

in which the third line really means, as different from the interpretation given by many commentators, that when Rādhā manifests her Mahābhāva ecstasy, she is in the midst of such an uninterrupted flow of supreme joy that the distinction between the subject (रमणी—Rādhā herself as the subject of the act of devotion) and the object (Absolute Lord Kṛṣṇa—रमण) is temporarily suspended as it were to yield place to one serene expanse of bliss-enjoying pure and unmixed. And because the Mahābhāva feeling does not manifest always, the underlying real relation of dualism between the Absolute and the devotee remains intact.

Lastly, according to the third derivative meaning the term *Rasa* means 'that which makes others enjoy'; in other words, the Absolute Being as *Bhagavān* not only Himself enjoys eternally Infinite ecstatic Bliss but also makes others enjoy the same by means of His *Rasa* attribute or *Hlādinī Śakti*. This meaning lying thus hidden within the word *Rasa* is made explicit in the line of Śruti Text रसं ह्येवायं लब्ध्वानन्दी भवति, "This (individual soul) becomes full of (supreme) joy by attaining Him (*Rasa*)".

From the above it appears how one apt word *Rasa* is so pregnant with deep meaning and contains in a nutshell, as it were, the whole theory of Vaisṇava Philosophy about the Concept of *Bhagavān*. And this important fact that *Bhagavān* is *Rasa* or Bliss embodied is to be accepted the more because by its admission we can arrive at the big theory of creation. To this effect, the text रसौ वै सः etc. is immediately followed by the text को ह्येवान्यात् कः प्रयायात् यदेष आकाश आनन्दो न स्यात् "who would have breathed, who would have lived, had this *Ākāśa* not been consisting of eternal bliss"! Now the word *आकाश* derivatively means आ समन्त्रान् सम्यक् च काशते दीप्यति यः सः i. e. 'One who is absolutely luminous all around, hence the Absolute Being who alone is Himself luminous and by whose light the whole universe is illuminated.' The word must be taken here in this root-sense, otherwise the whole context would be meaningless.¹ Thus the idea contained in the text comes to this—The universe is created and alive only because the Absolute consists of Bliss.

1. That the word *Akasa* in the Śruti text does not mean the elemental *akasa* but refers to *Vishnu* the Absolute Being is

There is indeed no doubt about the fact that both Infinite Reason (Pūrṇa Chit) and Eternal Bliss are the inseparable attributes of Bhagavān, still a most satisfactory explanation of the riddle of creation is possible only if we look to the attribute of Bliss. This point will be discussed in detail later on.

The theory of the Absolute having attributes being thus clearly proved by means of a good number of texts, it necessarily follows that He has a peculiar dwelling place and distinctive complexion and decorations which are all transcendental and not different in any way from His Swarūpa Śaktis or Bliss. Followers of the Monistic theory of Śaṅkara in their exposition of the philosophy of the Upanisads might urge that "God's dwelling place is the heart of man". But the statement can at once be retorted by saying— "Well, your Brahman (if by God you mean Brahman which you really do) is devoid of attributes, how can it then have a dwelling place? Having a dwelling place is no doubt an attribute and thus your exposition of the philosophy clearly exposes your own inconsistency". Besides, no body if true to his own conscience can positively assert that this is 'the' philosophy of the Upanisads. Even more he is not at all inclined to accept the supreme authoritativeness of the Bhāgavat, still he can never say that the theory of

also the view of Madhwacharya as appears from his comment on Ved. Sūtra I, 1--22, "को ह्येवान्यात् क प्राययाद यदेव आकाश आनन्दो न स्यात् इत्याकाशस्यानन्दमयत्वे हेतुरुक्तः न तु विष्णोरिति न मन्तव्यम् । यत्. "अस्य लोकस्य का गतिरित्याकाश इति हो वाचेत्यत्र भूताकाशस्य प्राप्ति न चार्था गुप्यन्ते किन्तु विष्णुर्देव स एव पापं वरीयानुदशीथ स एव पापंऽनन्तः इत्यादि लल्लुङ्गान् ।"

Abstract Monism is the philosophy of all the Upaniṣads. Ir-
 respectively of the Bhāgavata texts all that can possibly be
 said is that this is the apparent view of some of the Upaniṣads
 but not of all.

The real point however is that there is truth in the above
 statement of the opponent theorist, but not the whole
 truth. ✓ The concept of Bhagavān according to Vaiṣṇava Phi-
 losophy clearly implies that He dwells in the heart of man
 not as Bhagavān but in His partial aspect Paramātmā. The
 recognition of a dwelling place other than the heart of man
 and far beyond the sphere of the phenomenal worlds is what
 the Bhāgavata Cult emphatically makes, and that in agree-
 ment with various scriptural texts. Thus the Chhāndogya
 text “स भगवः कस्मिन् प्रतिष्ठित इति स्वे महिम्नि इति । अत

एवोक्तम् क इत्या वेद यत्र स इति” (VII, 24) clearly says that
 the dwelling place of Bhagavān is that which is wholly made
 up of His bliss and so is eternal, how can this be known
 to those who regard the Vedas as solely aiming at acts or
 sacrifices?”

Scriptures on the concept of Bhagavān.—

We have already said that the concept of Bhagavan im-
 plies that in Him all contradictions merge and conflicting at-
 tributes exist in a friendly way. This is evidenced by the
 following Śruti text cited by Madhwāchāryya in his commen-
 tary on the Vedānta Sūtra-I, 3 12—अस्थूलोऽनणुरमध्यमो
 मध्यमोऽव्यापको व्यापको हरि रादिरेनादि रविश्वो विश्वः सगुणो
 निर्गुण इति ’—“Hari (the Absolute) is not large, not small,
 not-medium, medium, not-pervading, pervading, primeval
 (i. e. beginning), having no beginning, not the universe, the

universe, with attributes, without attributes. To reconcile these contradictions we cannot but admit that the Absolute is the highest of all and at the same time accommodates Himself in the heart of a devotee—the heart which is a very small thing measuring only two fingers. He is eternally in the human form (and hence, limited), and at the same time in His aspect of the Immanent Regulator pervades the whole universe of beings; He is transcendent and immanent simultaneously; He, having eternally subjugated his own Māyā Śakti, is beyond the sphere of the Guṇas—Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, and consequently does not possess the attributes inhering in the phenomenal objects; and yet at the same time possesses numberless auspicious qualities." This text thus clearly falsifies the theory of the Absolute as a non-differenced substance as propounded by Śaṅkara and others.

The same idea also occurs in the Nṛsiṃha Tāpani Śruti-
तुरीयमतुरीयमात्मानमनात्मानमुग्रमनुग्रं वीरमवीरं महान्तममहान्तं
विष्णुमविष्णुं ज्वलन्तमज्वलन्तं सर्वतोमुखमसर्वतोमुखमित्रादिका,

in which the several attributes are affirmed and denied simultaneously of one and the same Absolute. The Brahman Purāṇa again states that 'He, the Highest Person, by reason of His Lordliness, consists of contradictory attributes viz that He is not large, not small, the universe, and not the universe.

Against the view that the Absolute is without name, form, body, senses, act, etc. it might be urged that if the Absolute is such a Being, how can the texts निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तम्

अशब्दम् अस्पर्शमरूपमव्यम्, सर्वकर्म सर्वकामः सर्वगन्धः सर्वरसः

(Śveta. VI, 19) be explained? Undoubtedly these texts occur in the same Upaniṣad, and consequently the subject matter is one and the same Absolute. The several attributes viz

having acts, form, desire, sound etc are affirmed and denied of one and the same Ultimate Reality. The only way to reconcile these contradictory statements is to take the terms in different senses in the different texts. Thus we should say that though the conception of such name, act, quality etc as are associated with phenomenal objects does not apply to the Absolute, yet the Absolute holds these very things of an altogether different character. In the phenomenal world, for example, an act means an exertion intended for the removal of some want or uneasiness felt by an entity; and because the Absolute is that in Whom all desires are eternally fulfilled to the fullest extent, He can never be doing such acts; all His acts spontaneously follow from the highest exuberance of eternal infinite bliss simply as sports. Similarly, a form means whatever in the phenomenal objects is perceived by the sense of sight which is not self-luminous, and consequently this cannot apply to the Being who is Self-luminous. This very fact clearly explains the reason why the Absolute is called in some texts **अनामा** having no name i. e. having no such names as we find in the phenomenal objects. His name being thus absolutely different from the names of phenomenal objects is not different from His intrinsic self of Bliss. So the Śruti says ॐ **आस्य जानन्तो नाम चिद्विविक्कन् महस्ते विष्णो सुमन्ति भजामहे । ॐ तत् सत्** (Quoted in the *ṣaṭṣandarbha*), in which the name of Viṣṇu is described as His Chit Śakti and is such that its very utterance, full or partial, with or without consciousness of its significance, arouses an inclination towards His devotion.

About his lordliness and hidden prowess the text is **सवा अयमस्य सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्येशान सर्वस्याधिपतिः** (Maitr. 7, 1). "He—This One (of the upaniṣads) is the controller of

all, the lord of all, the master of all." The fact of His eternity is strengthened by the Mahopanishad text—स ब्रह्मणा सृजति

स रुद्रेण विलापयति सोऽनुत्पत्तिरलयं एव हरिः परः परमानन्दः ।

He creates through Brahmā, dissolves through Rudra; He indeed is uncaused and non-decaying, He is Hari—the Highest, and consisting of the greatest bliss."

Recapitulation :—

Summing up the above statements we can finally arrive at the concept of Bhagavān as explained in the Bhagavata Cult. By Bhagavān is meant the Highest Being or the Highest stage in the hierarchy of spiritual manifestations of the Absolute as proved by all scriptural texts directly or indirectly. He has a form and body similar to that of a human being. His body is wholly made up of the sole ingredient of bliss or Rasa which involves the two other supreme elements of Reality and Knowledge. Though He possesses endless powers, Yet He eternally revels in the display of His Ilādmī Śakti or Rasa. He is eternal and the most primeval source of all bliss. He is self-existent and self-luminous. He is the cause of creation etc. of the world not directly but through His partial manifest Paramātmā—the Immanent Regulator of all beings. He Himself is indifferent to creation, and as such is impartially benevolent towards all beings. His sole function is to revel eternally in Infinite Ecstatic bliss and by His own Rasa or Ilādmī Śakti to make others enjoy bliss. In Him all powers— all the sixfold lordlinesses have eternally attained the fullest development, but His display of lordliness is always guided by a graceful charm, and as such He is preeminently and primarily Bhagavan or स्वयं भगवान् as differentiated from Nārāyaṇa who also is styled Bhagavān. In short, He is

our Highest Object of worship and devotion, blending in Himself the superlatives of all that we reverence as great and good—nay, of all that we love. He is the greatest loving Deity of Vaiṣṇavas. He is ever unknowable and inconceivable, and yet knowable and enjoyable only through His grace and benevolence. No philosophy, however lofty, has ever been or will ever be able to describe Him. No price, however great, has ever been or will ever be able to purchase Him. Faith—simple faith, steadfast adherence, insatiable hankering—this alone can realise Him, this alone can conquer Him, this alone can shake His indifference, this alone can compel Him to do anything and everything even against His will and conscience, this alone can bring Him down even to the most horrible hell. He is the greatest of all—the sole independent master of all, but there is one thing that He Himself also acknowledges as greater than Himself, as His master—and that thing is a devotee—a fervent devotee who loves the Lord not from any interested motive, but simply because He is eternal Love.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CONCEPT OF BRAHMAN:¹

The word Brahman, being derived from root *bṛh* (in the non-causal as well as in the causal state), means that which is the greatest of all and makes others great. (cf. **बृहत्वाद्**

बृहन्त्वाच्च तद् ब्रह्म परमं विदुः—Viṣṇu. I, 12, 75) In this sense it applies only to the Ultimate Reality or the Highest Person in whom there is the eternal simultaneous display to the fullest extent of the three-fold *taktis*. Such concept

1. See Appendix.

of the Highest Person, we have shown, is the same as the concept of Advaya Jñāna Tattva Bhagavān. The word Brhman, therefore, in the derivative sense means Bhagavān, and to avoid confusion we have applied the term Para Brahman to Bhagavān. But in the Bhāgavata verse चदन्ति etc. besides the term Bhagavān there are also the two terms Brahman and Paramātmā. Evidently, therefore, is some distinction between this term Brahman and Bhagavān. What, then is the significance of the concept of Brahman according to the Bhāgavata Cult ?

The concept of Brahman, which appears as the product of Śaṅkara's exposition of the philosophy of the Upaniśads, may be briefly indicated as follows—"Whatever is, is in reality one; there truly exists only one Universal Being called Brahman or Paramātmā or the Highest Self. This Being is of an absolutely homogeneous nature, it is pure Being, or, which comes to the same thing, Intelligence or Thought (Chaitanya, Jñāna). Intelligence or Thought is not to be predicated of Brahman as Its attribute, but constitutes Its very substance; Brahman is not a thinking Being but Thought Itself. It is absolutely destitute of qualities; whatever qualities or attributes are conceivable can only be denied of It". The Bhāgavata Cult describes this Brahman as the bodily lustre (cf. यद्वहेतं ब्रह्मोपनिषदि तदस्य तनुमः.....etc.—3rd śloka, Ādi Līla Charitāmṛta)

or a partial manifestation of the same Ultimate Reality Bhagavān—the stage in which the display of the endless auspicious qualities or, briefly speaking, of the three Swarūpa śakti's is not perceived. To explain by way of analogy - A speaker means one having the power of delivering speeches; but this power of speech sometimes remains latent

or in a potential state, and sometimes in the state of actual manifestation. Thus one and the same person is said to have two states—the Nirviśeṣa state when he does not speak, and the Saviśeṣa state when he actually delivers a speech. Similarly, what the purely monistic theory describes as Brahman is the Nirviśeṣa state of Bhagavān, while the stage of Bhagavān is one in which there is eternally going on the fullest display of His Śaktis. And because the Ultimate Reality is the same, and His powers are eternally infinite, we should never attach non-eternity to Brahman. Both the states being eternal, we cannot but admit that while Bhagavān is in the fullest display of His Rasa there is also the non-display of His attributes eternally going on simultaneously; and to realise the one or the other depends upon the relative superiority of the Jīva, caused by an explicit or implicit practice of the Cult of Bhakti.

It is evident, therefore, that the distinction between Bhagavān and Brahman is not absolute but one of degree only, and this is indicated by the word शब्दते in the verse. Religious minds there may be many, but the capacity for realisation is not the same in all. Some being fortunate enough in having been able to practise the cult of Bhakti through the grace of Bhagavān realises the Absolute as Bliss-embodied in the form of a human being and in eternal display of His Hlādinī Śakti; while others not yet so fortunate realise only the bodily lustre of the same Bhagavān without realising the distinctive features, potencies, dwelling place, associates etc. To take another example—To two observers taking their stand on the same spot one and the same tree appears differently viz, to one having the normal power of sight as a thing consisting of branches, leaves, flowers fruits etc., to the other suffering from a defect of eyesight as a more hazy substance; or

to the same observer one and the same tree from a distance appears as a mere tree and when in nearness appears definitely as this tree—say, mango, having such and such branches, leaves etc, and the tree will ever appear to him as a mere tree and not recognised in full if the observer either has not the capacity to near it or having the capacity does not care to approach for the purpose of full recognition. Whatever the case might be, this much is certain that the sight of the tree with full recognition is superior to the sight as a mere tree. Similarly, in the sphere of religion one realises the Absolute as Bhagavān, while another as Brahman, and the latter, it might be has not yet the capacity (i. e. devotional practice) but may afterwards attain it, for realisation as Bhagavān, or he might not care to realise as such even being possessed of the adequate means for such realisation. Whatever the case might be, there is not the least doubt that realisation of the Absolute as Bhagavān is superior to that as Brahman.

This very fact viz that in the two stages of manifestation there underlies the same principle of Advaya Jñāna Tattva, and that Brahman is the bodily lustre of the self-luminous limbs of the embodied substance Bhagavān, is clearly stated in the Bhāg. texts **ज्ञानयोगश्च भक्तिश्चो नैर्गुणयो भक्तिस्तत्त्वः । द्वयो-
रप्येक एवार्थो भगवच्छब्दलक्षणः ॥ यथेन्द्रियैः पृथग् द्वारैरर्थो बहु-
गुणाश्रयः । एको नानेयते तद्वद्भगवान् शस्त्रवर्मभिः ॥** (III, 33, 32-33). The meaning is this—Of the two kinds of religious practice viz the Bhakti Cult and the Jñāna Cult, the object is one and the same i. e. Bhagavān—as Bhagavān in the one case, as Brahman in the other, just in the same way as one and the same substance milk appears differently in contact with the different sense-organs viz as white in contact with the sense of sight, as sweet to the taste, as cold to the touch, and so on.

The same idea also occurs in the. Upaniṣad Text—स वा एष पुरुषोऽन्नरसमयः.....इदं पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठा पृथिवी पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठा अथर्वाङ्गिरसः पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठा महः पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठा ब्रह्म पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठा; and that very idea is echoed forth in the Gītā text—ब्रह्मणो हि प्रतिष्ठाहम् (XIV, 27). The line of the Gītā is to be read along with the verse that precedes—माञ्च योऽव्यभिचारेण भक्तियोगेन सेवते । स गुणान् समतीत्यैतान् ब्रह्मभूयाय कल्पते ॥, and the meaning is this—Bhagavān says—‘Whoever is devoted to me by means of an unchanged union of Bhakti can surpass the three guṇas—Sattwa, Rajas and Tamas (i. e. the miseries of mundane existence) and attain the nature (similarity in some respects) of Brahman. ‘If to this it be redargued ‘Well, how can your devotee—how can one practising the Cult of Bhakti—attain the nature of Brahman—the Pure Being or Homogeneous Substance—when that is possible by realisation according to the Cult of Jñāna.’ To that in reply Bhagavān says—‘Because I am the substratum of Brahman’,¹

In the Taittirīya texts cited above, in connection with the nature of Puruṣa or human personality, the hierarchy of substratums consisting of five stages is stated in five Anuvākas, after which in the sixth Anuvāka is given an account of Brahman and the subject matter terminates in the seventh Anuvāka with a description of the Absolute as Rasa or consisting of Bliss in the fullest display. From this as well as from the Vedānta Sūtra आनन्दमयोऽभ्यासात् (I, 1, 13),² the

1. See Appendix.

2. The Sūtra, according to all the commentators, means that the self consisting of Bliss is the Highest Self on account of multiplication. ‘The Section of the Tai. Up.’, says Rāmānuja, “which begins with the words सैवानन्दस्य मीमांसा

only conclusion we can arrive at is that the Absolute as Anāṇ-
damaya Puruṣa or Rasa is the highest substratum and as
such is higher than Brahma the non-differenced Substance.

As is stated above, there is no absolute distinction between
Bhagavān and Brahman both being eternal and Infinite, and
consequently by describing the former as the Pratisthā of
the latter (in the Gītā text ब्रह्मणो हि प्रतिष्ठाहम्) all that the
author really means is that the difference is in respect of mani-
festation only. Holders of the purely monistic theory might
interpret the word Pratisthā to mean 'image', to that our
reply is—Brahman in their view having no form or body can
by no means have an 'image'. If, for argument's sake, we sub-
stitute for the word Pratisthā its synonym Pratinā then also
the same conclusion would be arrived at; for the word प्रतिमा
derivatively (प्रति लक्ष्मीकृत्य माति परिमितो भवति यत्र मा
प्रतिमा) means 'that which limits itself and appears

भवति and terminates with the sloka यतो वाचो निवर्त्तन्ते
arrives at bliss supreme and not to be surpassed, by succe-
ssively multiplying inferior stages of bliss by a hundred,
now such supreme bliss cannot possibly belong to the indi-
vidual soul which enjoys only a small share of very limited
happiness mixed with endless pain and grief; and therefore
clearly indicates, as its abode, the Highest Self which differs
from all other selves in so far as being radically opposed to
all evil and of an unmixed blessed nature." Moreover, as
Sankar puts it, such meaning of the sūtra follows from lots
of Scrip. texts, e.g., रसं हेवायं लब्ध्वा नन्दी भवति, को हेवा-
न्यात् कः प्राप्स्यत्.....न स्यात्, एष हेवानन्दयति, सैषा-
नन्दस्य मीमांसा भवति, एतमानन्दमयमात्मानमुपसंक्रामति.
आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान्,.....आनन्दो ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात्,
विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म etc.

as such in the shape of Brahman'; in other words, Bhagavān while appearing as Brahman has not His infinite attributes concretely displayed, and this non-manifestation of the distinctive attributes constitutes the limitation, so to say, of Bhagavān, and because in Brahman the same unlimited powers of Bhagavān lie in a potential state the limitation is to be understood in respect of the realisation of the devotee.

From the above arguments based upon various scriptural texts it clearly follows therefore that the Ultimate Reality called Advaya Jñāna Tattwa or Bhagavān is the Highest Substance and hence is the Substratum of the concept which the theory of Pure Monism like Śaṅkara's describes as Brahman which Brahman according to Vaiṣṇava Philosophy is nothing but the eternal lustre of the blissful body of Bhagavān. And so the Charitāmṛta text in the explanation of the verse वदन्ति etc. runs as follows —

Tahāra angera Śuddha Kīraṇamāṇḍala
 Upaniṣad kahe tāre brahman suoirṇala
 Charmachakse dekhe yaichhe Sūryya nirviśesa
 Jñānamārge laite nāre Kṛṣṇera viśeṣa

"The Upaniṣad calls that Brahman the Pure Being which is the supersensuous lustre of the body of Bhagavān. Just as the gross sight of a human being perceives the sun only as a heap of lustre in which there is no manifestation of the attributes, limbs etc of the sun as a deity, so also the Cult of Jñāna realises only the bodily lustre of Kṛṣṇa and not Him as displaying His attributes, limbs, dwelling place, associates etc." The same idea is echoed forth in the Brhma Saṃhitā text—

यस्य प्रभा प्रभवतो जगदङ्ककोटि-
 कोटिष्वशेषवसुधादिविभूतिभिन्नम् ।

तद् ब्रह्म निष्कलमनन्तशेषभूतम्
गोविन्दमादिपुरुषं तमहं भजामि ॥ (V, 46).

Chapter V.

THE CONCEPT OF PARAMĀTMĀ

In our explanation of the concept of Advaya Jñāna Tat-twa or Bhagavān, it was clearly stated with sufficient elaboration that Bhagavān, although He is the Highest Reality or the Absolute of Absolutes, eternally revels in the fullest display of His Swarūpa Śaktis that find their culmination in Bliss, and that He displays His Vahirangā Śakti i. e. is the cause of the origination, sustentation and dissolution of the universe not directly but through the medium of His own partial manifest—the highest Incarnate so to say—Paramātmā. If, now, we want to have a clear exposition of the concept of Paramātmā, we should first of all look to the Bhāgavata texts—

क्षेत्रज्ञ एता मनसो विभूतीर्जिह्वस्य मायारचितस्य नित्याः ।
आविर्हिताः कापि तिरोहिताश्च शुद्धो विचष्टे ह्यविशुद्धकर्तुः ॥
क्षेत्रज्ञ आत्मा पुरुषः पुराणः सत्यः स्वयं ज्योतिरजः परेशः ।
नारायणो भगवान् वासुदेवः स्वमाययात्मन्यवधीयमानः ॥

(V, 11, 12-13).

The underlying sense is this—Paramātmā is the most primeval, the uncaused cause of the creation etc. of the phenomenal world, absolutely self=luminous, ever remains the same without undergoing any change and is thus devoid of birth, growth and decay, and is the Lord of Brahmā and others. He is the Immanent Regulator of, and is cognisant

of everything in connection with, the Jivas or individual souls, and being but the partial aspect of Bhagavān is endowed with the sixfold lordships. Though as the Immanent Regulator He is eternally present in the heart of all created beings—the effects of His own Māyā Śakti, yet He is not in any way affected by Māyā, and hence ever manifests Himself in the midst of His own intrinsic selfhood.

He is the greatest and most impartial witness to the doings of all beings, and, subject only to the law of retribution, He directs them to a diversity of activities. (cf. उपद्रष्टानुमन्ता च भर्ता भोक्ता महेश्वरः । परमात्मेति चाप्युक्तो देहेऽस्मिन् पुरुषः परः ॥, Gītā). Though both are indestructible (akṣarah) ever retaining their sameness, Pramātmā is to be carefully distinguished from the indestructible and Kūṭastha Jīva as is evident from the word अन्यः in the Gītā texts—“द्वाविमौ पुरुषौ लोके क्षरश्चाक्षर एव च । क्षरः सर्वाणि भूतानि कूटस्थोऽक्षर उच्यते ॥ उत्तमः पुरुषस्त्वन्यः परमात्मेत्युदाहृतः । यो लोकत्रयमाविश्य विमर्त्यव्यय ईश्वरः ॥” And the very word अन्यः in the text implies further that Paramātmā ever retains His State of Saviśeṣa Brahman and is thus to be distinguished from Nirviśeṣa Brahman.¹

He is called Vāsudeva inasmuch as He pervades and is the support of all beings and knowing full well their all He is preeminently the ‘Kṣetrajña Ātmā’. We say ‘preeminently called’ because, as appears from the Gītā Texts, Jīva or individual soul also is called Kṣetrajña Ātmā. The word Ksetra (क्षेत्र) means body or corporeal frame, and because the rational principle called Ātmā lies at the root of all mental

1. See Appendix.

phenomena that take place by reason of certain processes going on within this organic system, Jiva at this stage of its accidental resort in the body is called Kṣetrajña or 'one having knowledge of the body.' "But", it might be urged, "the individual soul possesses knowledge of other bodies as well, how then is it called Kṣetrajña?" Indeed the Jiva possesses knowledge of a few more bodies; but the number of such bodies is almost nill in comparison with the unlimited universe; besides, in the pieces of knowledge that thus accrue to the soul there is no simultaneity, for Jiva is not all-pervading. Briefly speaking, owing to the finitude of the Jiva the knowledge it has is no doubt limited and since such knowledge is not at all possible unless the Jiva lies within a particular organism, Jiva is technically called Kṣetrajña. This Kṣetrajña—attribute however is only a relative one owing to the fact that the Absolute Pramātmā pervading simultaneously the entire universe is the Immanent Regulator of all beings, and if any being is to be absolutely and really called Kṣetrajña, it is Paramātmā. So it is said in the Gītā Text क्षेत्रज्ञैर्व्योक्तं यत्तज्ज्ञानं मतं मम (XIII, 2); in other words, whatever knowledge there is in the individual body caused by the rational principle and the sense organs and whatever distinctive knowledge the individual soul has of its own accidental dwelling place—the body is due to a bit of the Infinite knowledge constituting an attribute of the Absolute Pramātmā.

That Paramātmā is a partial manifest of Bhagavān appears from numerous texts. Thus in the Gītā Text—अथवा बहुनैतेन किं ज्ञानेन त्वार्जुन । विष्टभ्याहमिदं कृत्स्नमेकांशेन स्थितो जगत् ॥ (X, 42)—it is said that Bhagavān in His partial aspect as Paramātmā pervades the whole universe.

The reason again why Bhagavān is called Puruṣottama (पुरुषोत्तम) and Paramātmā called Puruṣa is to be found in the Mahopaniṣad. The word Puruṣa derivatively means that which resides in a body, and Ātmanā is called Puruṣa when it resides in a body along with the mind and senses. Analogously, the Absolute is called Puruṣha because it pervades all Puruṣas (तं पुरुषं पुरुषो निवेश्य Mahopaniṣad), also because It has a body, mind and senses which however are absolutely different from those in the phenomenal world. To this meaning of Puruṣa the meaning of the word Person as indicated in the Hegelian Philosophy has, I am afraid, a close resemblance. And so it is said—"This union of individuality and universality in a single manifestation with the implication that the individuality is the essential and permanent element to which the universality is almost in the nature of an accident is what forms the cardinal point in personality" (Wallace's Logic of Hegel). Indeed in Puruṣa in the sense of an individual soul residing in a body, the individuality of the Jīva is combined with universality inas-much as each Puruṣa is related to all others—all being the creation of one and the same Ultimate Reality; yet the individuality as pure jīva is essential and permanent while the relation of universality is accidentally effected by the Māyā Śakti of Bhagavān. In Bhagavān as Parmātmā, similarly, there is the combination of the two elements inasmuch as Bhagavān by reason of His transcendental character posits His Individuality and at the same time as the Immanent Regulator pervades the whole universe thereby bringing out to significance the relation of universality. In this sense we are to understand the personality of the Absolute Being, the more because it tallies with the views of all the religious systems amongst the civilised nations.

A reference to Paramātmā the Immanent Regulator we also find in various Śruti texts, e. g., एको देवः सर्वभूतेषु गूढः सर्वव्यापी सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा । कर्माध्यक्षः सर्वभूतादिवासः साक्षी चेता केवलो निर्गुणश्च ॥, Svet. 6, 11.—'One and the same Selfluminous Self-conscious Being, revelling in His own Bliss, devoid of all qualities and yet possessed of all auspicious qualities, the best director in all acts and witness to all doings, pervades the entire universe, and resides as the Immanent Regulator in the heart of all beings.'

Paramātmā Puruṣa has three manifestations,¹ viz—

(1) as the Immanent Regulator and Observer of the totality of Individual souls and phenomenal worlds. In the system of Vaiṣṇava Philosophy this is called Mahāviṣṇu or Kāṇārvaśāyī Saṁkarsaṇa (कारणार्णवशायी संकर्षण), and it is He who by way of his ईक्षण towards Māyā (i. e. by way of entertaining an idea or thought of creation) created the universe :

(2) as the Regulator of the totality of Individual souls. This is called समष्टिजीवन्तर्यामी पुरुष or गर्भोदकशायी पुरुष. It is from His navel-lotus that Hiraṇyagarbha Brahmā took his birth;

(3) as the regular of each individual soul—also called व्यष्टिजीवन्तर्यामी or क्षीरोदशायी पुरुष.

This three fold manifestation of one and the same Advaya Jñāna Tattva is indeed possible just in the same way as one and the same thing Vāyu called in its intrinsic self-hood

1. On this point the verse in the Charitamrita is—

सङ्कर्षण कारणतोयशायी

गर्भोदशायी च पयोद्विधशायी ।

शेषश्च यस्यांशकलाः स नित्या-

नन्दाख्यराम शरणं ममास्तु ॥

Prāṇa Vāyu manifests itself in, and thereby regulates the functions of, the organic systems in the different created beings such as moveables and immoveables (cf.—वायुर्युथैकोभुवनं प्रविष्टो रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपं बभूव । एकस्तथा सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो वहिष्व ॥, Kaṭh. V, 10)

Relation between the three concepts of Bhagavān, Paramātmā and Brahman:—

- ✓ From what is stated above it appears that the relation between the three concepts of Bhagavān, Paramātmā and Brahman is not one of absolute distinction but of identity in the midst of difference. We may express the relation by means of the same technical term Achintya Bhedābheda as characterises the whole system of Vaiṣṇava Philosophy. The relation, in other words, is one of gradation in the hierarchy of manifestations of one and the same Ultimate Reality Advaya Jñāna Tattva or Bhagavān. Indeed the one Ultimate Reality Bhagavān has got endless manifestations as the different Śruti texts say—एको वशी सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा एकं रूपं बहुधा यः करोति (Kaṭha II, 12), एकं सन्नं बहुधा दृश्यमानम् “the one existent manifested in diverse ways”, एकोऽपि सन्नं बहुधा यो ऽवभाति (Kaṭha). Of these endless manifestations, however, the three with which we are concerned here are the most prominent, and hence the Bhāgavata texts refer to these three alone. The character of such manifestation again depends upon the nature of devotion or meditation. Those who reach the highest stage of meditation realise Bhagavān as Bhagavān, while others not reaching so far realise only His partial aspects. This very fact has been clearly stated by Madhvāchāryya in his commentary on the Ved. sūtra—

प्रज्ञानतरपृथक्त्ववद् दृष्टिश्च तदुक्तम् (III, 3, 5-2), where he says —“उपासनाभेदेन दर्शनभेद —“The difference in realisation is due to difference in the nature of devotion”, and cites the Kāmāṭha Śruti “अन्नदृष्टयो वहिर्दृष्टयोऽवतारदृष्टयः सर्वदृष्टय इति” which means that some realise Hari as revealed to their contemplative mind alone, some realise Him as presented to their mind as well as sense-organs, some again realise Him in His aspect of an incarnation, while others realise Him completely. Just as a thing made with skilful ingenuity of pieces of several varieties of silk cloth of different colours, although collectively it appears from a particular position of the observer as a cloth of one complex colour in which the different colours blend, manifests itself differently as of this colour or that according to the relative position of the observer; so also one and the same Ultimate Reality Bhagavān Śrī Kṛṣṇa blending in Himself all the endless manifestations by means of His Parā Śaktis manifests Himself in one particular aspect or the other according to the nature of devotion in one cult or the other followed by a seeker after truth”. Similarly in the Nārada Pancharātra we find—“Just as a piece of gem called Vaidūryya which consists of several colours, blue, yellow etc, blending together, appears as blue, yellow or otherwise to an observer according to the relative position in standing and gazing, so also Bhagavān in whom all the lordships are in the fullest degree of manifestation appears differently according to the distinctive nature of the means adopted for realisation”.

If the relation between the three concepts indicated above is really understood it would leave no doubt as to the fact that the concept of Bhagavān as Advaya Jñāna Tattva is the

central theme of the Bhāgavata consistently with the theory that the Bhāgavata is the unfold of the true meaning of the Ved. Sūtras and of the Gāyatrī. But to establish this vital point on a firmer basis we are required to show further whether the Bhāgavata stands the test of the main canon relating to the determination of the real significance of an authoritative text. Now the fundamental scheme of this canon as adopted by all expounders of Hindu philosophy is that there must be an agreement between (a) Upakrama (beginning), (b) Upasamhāra (conclusion), (c) abhyāsa (repetition), (d) apūrvatā (the distinctive feature not to be found elsewhere, i. e., uniqueness), (e) phala (effect), (f) arthavāda (laudation), and (g) upaṁti (argumentative mark). To explain the bearing of this canon upon the Bhāgavata itself we might say in the first place that from the concluding verse of the Bhāg., viz—कस्मै येन विभाषितोऽयं

.....सत्यं परं धीमहि” it is quite evident that there is complete agreement between this meaning and the meaning of the first verse already explained. Secondly, we find ‘repetition’ is indicated in the verse “कलिमलसंहति.....कथा

प्रसङ्गैः” which means that in other scriptural texts there might be repeated references to the different manifestations or partial aspects of the Absolute but the concept of the Absolute Bhagavān Himself is repeated over and over again in the Bhāg. purāṇa alone. Herein also lies the fact that this scriptural text is quite unique in character as a religious treatise. Then again as to the ‘effect’, we come to know from the verse “पिबन्ति ये इमवतः.....व्रजन्ति तच्चरण-सरोरुहान्तिकम्” that whoever hear, contemplate and medi-

tate upon the contents of the Bhāg. get their minds purified—the minds that have already been tainted and vitiated with attachment to mundane affairs, and thereby realise the Highest Self. Nor is laudation wanting, for the verse

“यं ब्रह्मा वरुणेन्द्र.....तस्मै नमः” lets us know that the

Being who is always enlogised by Brahmā, Varuna, Indra etc, who is ever sung in praise in the Sāman verses as well as in the Up. texts along with the subsidiary studies, who is sighted or realised even by the released souls of ascetics only if they are bent upon an uninterrupted flow of steady remembrance, whose glory can never be gauged by any being whatsoever—such a Being is always to be adored and worshipped. Finally, with regard to an argumentative mark we might refer to the verse

“भगवान् सर्वभूतेषु.....अनुमापकैः” the meaning of which is as follows:—That Bhagavān dwells in the heart of all beings as the Immanent Regulator is established by the following reasoning—the organs, buddhi etc, perceive things, but they themselves are irrational and so non-illuminating, their perception therefore is possible only if there is some underlying principle which is self-luminous and this self-luminous substance is the Immanent Regulator and in that case the organs buddhi etc must be regarded as instrumentalities.

BOOK III.

Chapter I.

THE CONCEPT OF KṚṢṆA AS THE ABSOLUTE.

We have seen how the Bhāgavata cult establishes on a sound and sure basis the concept of the Absolute as Advaya Jñāna Tattwa or Bhagavān. We have also seen how this concept, revealed as it was to the author Vādarāyana in his spiritual meditation or Samādhi and consequently expressed in the beginning verse of the Bhāgavata, is the most natural and real significance of the Vedānta system of Philosophy—the system which, being the real statement of the Philosophy of the Upaniṣads, is the highest stage of the speculative thought of the Hindus. But, as was stated in the chapter on the four topics for discussion in the present treatise, the Bhāgavata cult does establish not merely the concept of Bhagavān but in a more definite way that Kṛṣṇa is the Bhagavān. To establish this point we are to follow the same method of argumentation as was adopted in arriving at the concept of Advaya Jñānatattwa or Bhagavān. In other words, we are to show in the first place that the whole theory of the Kṛṣṇa cult is contained in a nutshell, as it were, in the beginning verse of the Bhāgavata.¹

Thus to begin with—In the Bhāgavata text Kṛṣṇa is described as Para Brahman having a human form, and this point of His being the Para Brahman is indicated by the word “Para” in the verse. According to the Swarūpa Lakṣaṇa, He is true since the Śruti about the Para Brahman says सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म (Taitt. II. 1, 1), ऋतं सत्यं परं ब्रह्म (Mahānār., 12, 1). “He is Satyavrata, Satya-para and Trisatyn,

1. See appendix

as the Bhāg. says (X, 2, 26), and the word 'Satya' implies further that the intrinsic nature of His form is ever unchangeable since unchangeableness is inseparably connected with 'truth'.

The Tāṭastha lakṣaṇa of Kṛṣṇa, again, is stated in the clause धाम्ना स्वेन निरस्तकुहकम्. Through the instrumentality of His own dwelling place Mathurā (स्वेन धाम्ना) which is made up of the sole ingredient of His own Chit-Śakti in the highest display, Kṛṣṇa ever puts an end to the miseries of mundane existence the effect of His own Vahiraṅgā Śakti Māyā. Indeed the Gopālotṭaratāpanī Śruti (verse 64) describes Mathurā as that in which there is eternally the highest essence of that selfknowledge whereby mundane existence is completely overthrown (the word being grammatically derived from root मन्थ् or मथि). Thus the plain meaning of the clause is—Unless and until the individual soul by taking recourse to the cult of Bhakti aspires after that state of ecstatic bliss which consists in constant devotion and servitude to Kṛṣṇa as eternally residing in His own divine heaven Mathurā there is no hope of attaining that release which cuts asunder all fetters of Karman and puts an end to all the threefold miseries of mundane existence. Next His beatific sports are thus indicated in the verse. The construction of the verse will now be आद्यस्य (तस्य) यतः यस्मात् गृहात् जन्म (तस्मात्) य इतरतः अन्यत्र गृहे अर्थेषु कंसवञ्चनादिषु विषयेषु अभिज्ञः सन् अन्वयात्, यः हृदा (संकल्पमात्रेणैव) आदिकषये ब्रह्मणे हिरण्यगर्भाय ब्रह्म (चेदं) तेने, यत् यत्र लीलाविषये सूरयः मुह्यन्ति, यत् यत्र लीलाविषये तेजोवारिमृदां यथा विनिमयो भवति एवम्भूतं न सत्यं परं धीमहि। Although Kṛṣṇa as Nanda's son is eternally in the midst of ecstatic sports in

His own dwelling place consisting of Mathurā, Dvārakā & Gokula, yet with a view to manifest His Līlā to worldly beings He appeared in His fullest splendour in the house of Vasudeva, and thence went to the place of Nanda because He was conscious of the fact that there would be manifest His sports in the matter of deluding the demon king Kaiṣa. At this time, though He was ever bound down to the devotional spirit of His constant divine associates the Gopas and Gopīs and so His lordship would not posit itself, yet in order to make Hiranyagarbha Brahmā bow down to him in reverence and awe He manifested to Brahmā all His diverse aspects of lordship simply by a fiat of His will. These his indescribable beatific sports are such that their realisation makes His devotees benumbed with supersensuous joy; and He being the original fountain-head of all conceivable and inconceivable lustre, even objects like the moon ever conscious of their own beauty and lustre are reduced to pale lustreless objects, so to say, and there is naught so stockish and hard but is moved and melted with supreme joy.

Thus interpreted the beginning verse of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa clearly involves the theory of Kṛṣṇa as the Ultimate Reality or Bhagavān. And the fact cannot be gainsaid in-as-much as it is quite natural that the author Vāṇarāyaṇa should in his spiritual ecstasy indicate tersely at the very outset the sum and substance of the theory which he elaborates in sufficient detail throughout the whole volume of texts. Yet if any body objects to the method of interpretation herein adopted and to the want of clearness and explicitness on the point, to that our reply is that there is a positive statement—clear as broad daylight—that Kṛṣṇa and nothing but Kṛṣṇa is the Ultimate Reality according to the true view of the Bhāgavata. We have already stated more than once that Bhagavān, though eternally realising Himself in beatitude in His own

supreme heaven, appears for the purpose of creation in His partial manifest—Paramātmā Puruṣa who by way of displaying His Vahiraṅgā Śakti Māyā is the cause of creation, sustentation and absorption of the universe. This Paramātmā Puruṣa, again, though Himself the substratum of endless infinite attributes, incarnates in endless ways by way of a partial display of the attributes whenever occasion arises for serving the purpose of good to the universe.

The Incarnate Beings, therefore, are related to the Paramātmā Puruṣa as parts to the whole, and in their nonmanifest state lie in a germinal state, as it were, in Paramātmā. Besides, being the ultimate substratum of the endless Incarnates, Bhagavān Himself also in His fullest splendour manifests to the phenomenal world whenever the urgency of the excessively miserable state of the world requires it. Accordingly, in the Bhāgavata context of the enumeration of some of the endless Avatāras, we find a verse which says that towards the end of the Dvāparayuga Kṛṣṇa Himself, along with his constant divine associates-in-Līlā, eternally manifests to the phenomenal world in order to save the world from tyrannous oppression. From this it might plausibly be conjectured that like Buddha, Christ or other incarnations, Kṛṣṇa also is a mere Avatāra and not the Ultimate Reality. To remove this doubt the sage Vādaśāyana makes a positive, emphatic and unambiguous statement about Kṛṣṇa's absoluteness in the verse—

एतं चांशकला पुंसः कृष्णस्तु भगवान् स्वयम् ।

इन्द्रारिव्याकुलं लोकं सृजयन्ति युगे युगे ॥

Just as the text already cited and explained, viz. यद्दन्ति etc is a Mahāvākya or great utterance about the Absolute Being as the Highest Substance consisting of attributes similarly the present verse is to be regarded as another Mahā-

vākya about Kṛṣṇa being that Absolute Being, and as such it requires an elaborate explanation.

Rendered into English the verse means—These (supreme beings referred to in the preceding verses) are but the partial manifestations or remote aspects of the Paramātmā Puruṣa who Himself is the first partial manifestation of Bhagavān, while Kṛṣṇa Himself is Bhagavān as the Ultimate Reality; and these supreme beings, manifesting themselves from time to time, bless the world and bring in peaceful harmony therein whenever it goes down under the oppression of some tyrannous being operating mercilessly and sinfully in every possible way.

The text occurs as the twentyeighth verse in that portion of the first skandha, third chapter of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa which deals with the different Avatāras. It is preceded by several other texts of which one i. e. the twentythird verse—"एकौनविंशे विंशतिमे वृष्णिषु प्राप्य जन्मनी । रामकृष्णविति भुवो भगवानहरद् भरम् ॥"—states that Bhagavān Himself as Kṛṣṇa attended by His partial manifest Valarāma manifested Himself amongst the Vṛṣṇis and bore up the burden of the world while it was sinking down under the tyrannous oppression of the demon Kainsa. Apparently, therefore, in the two verses two different statements are made about Kṛṣṇa, viz—(a) that Kṛṣṇa like Matsya, Kūrma etc. is a mere Avatāra or Incarnate Being, (b) that He is Svayaṁ Bhagavān or the Ultimate Reality—the Avatārī whose endless incarnations Matsya, Kūrma etc. are. Now the question is 'which of the two verses has greater force?' A solution of this question will at once remove the doubt whether Kṛṣṇa is a mere Incarnation or The Absolute Being Himself. To determine this vital

point so as to arrive at the main pivot of the present treatise we are required to give an exegesis and apologetic of Vaisnavism—nay, of Hinduism in general.

Now the fundamental scheme of our old exegesis and apologetic is stated in the following maxim—

**“श्रुतिलिङ्गवाक्यप्रकरणस्थानसमाख्यानं समवाये पारदौर्बल्यम्
अर्थविप्रकर्षात्”**. On this maxim all the fathers of Hinduism

based their respective arguments for establishing their own pet theories. The different interpretations of the scriptural texts which have given birth to the sectarian religious tenets in Hinduism have been made not without taking recourse to this very maxim. Even Vyāsa who is appropriately styled the great fountainhead of the currents of Hindu thought had this maxim in view when he wrote the Ved. Sūtras, e.g. the Sūtra III, 3—50 which is interpreted by Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja as involving a reference to this main canon of exegesis. It is not unnatural, therefore, that Jīva Goswāmī in his zeal for an exposition of true Kṛṣṇa philosophy has taken recourse to this admitted maxim.¹

To understand the meaning of the canon it is necessary to note at first that Śāstras are those that instruct us and as such they are broadly classified into two, viz—(a) Some instruct by way of direct statements, (b) some by way of statements in which the real meaning lies hidden under the garb of another apparent meaning. The former is technically called Śruti inasmuch as it is a direct statement and is such that its real significance is clearly made out by itself irrespective of any other statement. The word Śruti, therefore, in the maxim means ‘direct and unambiguous statement’, and the whole canon may be thus explained :—of the several

1. See Appendix

means of proof, viz., those constituted by (a) direct statement, (b) inferential mark, (c) syntactical connexion, (d) leading subject matter, (e) instruction in the shape of a legend or a laudatory verse,—each succeeding one has weaker force than the preceding one owing to remoteness of meaning.

On the basis of this maxim the statement in कृष्णस्तु

भगवान् स्वयम् is to be regarded as of greater force than, and different from, the other verses about Kṛṣṇa within the prakaraṇa of avatāras. Even if for argument's sake this text be regarded as within the leading subject matter of avatāras, yet it is to be regarded as of greater force according to the maxim 'last though not the least'. Besides, the use of the particle 'तु' makes this statement an emphatic one and regarded as a Paribhāṣā having the guiding force. Further, from the fact that even in the verses about avatāras the word 'भगवान्' has been used with reference to Kṛṣṇa only and not to the other avatāras, the intention of the author is quite clear that Kṛṣṇa is not an avatāra but the Ultimate Reality whose manifestations the different avatāras are. Moreover, owing to the partial manifestation of the sixfold lordships although the term in Hindu Śāstras applies also to Nārāyaṇa and others, yet in such cases the term is to be understood in a relative sense whereas Kṛṣṇa is Bhagavān in the absolute sense; and this fact is indicated by the word 'स्वयम्' appended to 'भगवान्' as well as by the nature of the text in which 'the being Bhagavān' is predicated of Kṛṣṇa and not Kṛṣṇaism of Bhagavān. Hereby thus is removed the doubt 'that Bhagavān is something else of which Kṛṣṇa is a manifestation.'

The real fact is that, as revealed in the direct emphatic statement in the Bhāgavata mahāvākya cited above, Kṛṣṇa is the Ultimate Reality or Advaya Jñāna Tattva whose bodily lustre is the Brahman as conceived in the absolute-monistic theory, whose partial manifestations are the Paramātmā Puruṣa and the endless incarnations, and who is the original source of those endless powers whereby the phenomenal world and individual souls are created, sustained and regulated in every way.

On a closer scrutiny it would appear that the scheme of exegesis as implied in the above maxim is this—(a) Scripture (or direct statement), (b) Doubt as to the correct interpretation thereof, (c) Criticism, (d) Reconciliation of texts with the context, (e) Synthesis of the meaning thus established of particular texts and the general purpose and scheme of the whole scripture. Working upon this plan we can arrive at a most satisfactory and rational theory of Vaiṣṇavism—nay, of Hinduism in general—based upon the scriptures; and in that case there would no longer be keenly felt a justification for the oft-quoted dictum धर्मस्य तत्त्वं निहितं गुहायाम्.

Indeed Hindu Religion in all its sectarian aspects is based upon the scriptures. It is also natural that doubt arises about the correct interpretation and true significance of the scriptures; but in order that the doubt might not lead to the Humane Scepticism which yields nothing whatsoever, we must not allow ourselves to be entirely lost in the dogmatic slumber but stir to enquire into the critical faculty of the understanding, and cautiously proceeding in such real philosophic speculation at last reach a stage in which the critique of pure reason yields a most satisfactory solution of the riddle of religion.

Let us first examine the practical bearing of this method upon the Upaniṣad Texts taken as a whole:—

There is a vagueness about the true philosophy of the Upanisads. This is due to the many apparently conflicting statements about one and the same subject matter. Hence doubt arises as to the real significance of the texts. To take a concrete instance—In the Uhhā. text अस्य लोकस्य का गतिरित्याकाश इति होवाच सर्वाणि ह वा इमानि भूतानि आकाशादेव समुत्पद्यन्त आकाशं प्रत्यस्तं यन्त्याकाशो ह्येवैभ्यो ज्यायान् आकाशः

परायणम् (IX, 1), Ākāśa is evidently described as the uncaused reality from which all things are created and in which they merge in final dissolution. Similarly in the same Upanisad from the text प्राण इति होवाच सर्वाणि ह वा इमानि भूतानि प्राणमेवाभिसंविशन्ति प्राणमभ्युज्जिहते सैषा देवता.....

it appears as if Prāṇa is the ultimate cause of all beings. Again, we find in the Taitt. II—1 text—तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन

आकाशः सम्भूतः—a statement that Ākāśa is created from Ātmā. Similarly in the Ait. texts (I) Prāṇa is described as created by Puruṣa. Now all these latter texts are evidently contradictory to the former group. Hence a doubt arises as to the true meaning of these texts, and to remove the doubt a reconciliation with the context need be effected. In the Taitt. and Ait. texts Prāṇa and Ākāśa are evidently used in the sense of breath (air) and ether respectively; and these are included in the elements which, as evidenced by lots of texts, constitute the ingredient of the world which is a created object. No amount of reasoning can convince us that the elements which are but unconscious substances constitute the central theme of the Upanisads. If the Upanisads are the basis of true religion which they are, it must be admitted that they teach us to be devoted to and worship the Highest

Self as the Ultimate Reality pervading the whole universe of beings. This very fact is emphatically stated in the text

“आत्मनि विज्ञाते सर्वमिदं विज्ञातं भवति इदं सर्वं यद्यमात्मा”.

This latter text, therefore, like similar other texts is a direct and unambiguous statement which sublimates the force of all other texts intended as nothing but secondary precepts. Consistently with this salient fact, the word *Ākāśa* in the Chhā. text above is to be interpreted to mean ‘that which shines all around with its own halo of glory’, and so means nothing but the Highest Self-luminous Substance. This meaning of *Ākāśa* also occurs in the Taitt. text को हेवान्यात्

etc. Similarly, the word *Prāṇa* in the above text means the Highest Breath or Immortality, which meaning applies to nothing but the Ultimate Reality; and this very idea also occurs elsewhere, e.g., Taitt. III, 3 प्राणो ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात्.

Such reconciliation of the texts with the context necessarily leads to a synthesis of the meaning thus established of the particular texts and the general purpose or scheme of the whole Upanisad—which purpose is nothing but the knowledge of Brahman as the Ultimate Reality.

Applying the same method to the Bhāgavata Purāṇa—we find a direct statement about Kṛṣṇa’s absoluteness is made in the verse कृष्णस्तु etc. But, notwithstanding this single utterance, there are many texts both in the Bhāgavata and elsewhere from which it appears as if Kṛṣṇa is a partial aspect of the Absolute. The principal bhāgavatic texts of this nature are—

(a) तत्रांशेनावतीर्णस्य etc. (X, 1, 2),

(b) दिष्ट्याम्ब.....अंशेन साक्षात्.....(X, 2, 41),

- (c) ततो जगन्मङ्गलमच्युतांशम् (X, 2, 18),
 (d) एतौ भगवतः.....अवतीर्णाविहांशेन.....(X)
 (e) ताविमौ वै भगवतो हरेरंशाविहागतौ.....,
 (f) नारायणसमो गुणैः (X, 8, 19),
 (g) द्विजात्मजा मे.....कलावतीर्णावनेर्भरासुरान्.....

The non-bhāgavatic texts are—

- (h) उज्जहारात्मनः केशौ सितकृष्णौ महामुने (Viṣṇu purāṇa)
 (i) स चापि केशौ हरिरुद्वचर्हे
 शुक्रमेकमपरञ्चापि कृष्णम् ।

.....

तयोरेको बलभद्रो बभूव

कृष्णो द्वितीयः केशवः संवभूव । (Muhā.),

these texts corresponding to the bhāg. text II, 7—26.

Apparently the verses, owing to the presence of the word 'अंश' or 'कला', imply as if Kṛṣṇa is not the Absolute Being but a partial aspect of Hari or Nārāyaṇa or Mahākāla. Hence there arises a doubt about the real significance of the Mahāvākya कृष्णस्तु etc. But the doubt will be removed if we can reconcile the texts with the context. To effect such reconciliation we should explain the verses in the manner of Jīva Goswāmī thus:—

- (A) The word 'अंश' or 'कला' in the verses refers to the various incarnations that are regarded as the partial aspects of the Absolute Being, and has been used therein to indicate the fact that when the Absolute Being Himself incarnates in His own intrinsic selfhood, i.e. in His fullest aspect, it must be understood that the various incarnations also manifest themselves to the phenomenal world at the time, the simple

reason being that parts can never exist apart from the whole. (B) The expression **नारायणसमो गुणैः** means 'To whom (Kṛṣṇa) Nārāyaṇa bears a resemblance in many respects, but Who Himself is Nārāyaṇa in the absolute sense as evidenced by the bhāg. text **नारायणस्त्वं न हि सर्वदेहिनाम्** etc. (C) Regarding the verse (g), which apparently implies as if Mahākāla is the Absolute, it is to be remembered that, though some scriptural texts (Purāṇas) establish Mahākāla as the Absolute yet this point is quite inconsistent with the general purpose of the bhāg. purāṇa; besides, as already discussed, the purāṇas of this nature belong to the Tāmasika class and as such are inferior in respect of authoritativeness to those of the Sāttvika class of which the Bhāgavata is the highest representative; that Mahākāla is not the Absolute according to the Bhāg. view is further indicated by the literal meaning of the verse itself. The expression '**कलावतीर्णौ**' in the text therefore means 'appearing along with His partial aspects' or 'appearing in the phenomenal world which is here described as '**कला**' on the basis of the Śruti text **पादोऽस्य विश्वा भूतानि**, and the whole text indicates that Mahākāla represents the bodily lustre of the Absolute Kṛṣṇa, in which a being merges on attaining release (cf. **महाकालज्योतिरिव मुक्ताः प्रविशन्ति**—Harivaṃśa). (D), In the non-bhāgavatic texts the word '**केश**' means '**अंशु**' or lustre on the basis of the text —**अंशवो ये प्रकाशन्ते मम ते केशसंज्ञिताः । सर्वज्ञाः केशवं तस्मान्मामाहुर्मुनिसत्तम ॥**, and the expression **सितकृष्णौ** refers to Vāsudeva and Saṃkarsaṇa the two partial aspects of Kṛṣṇa.

The reconciliation of the several texts with the context being thus effected it must be admitted that the true Bhāg. theory of the Absolute lies hidden in these texts under

various garbs; and, because the text **कृष्णस्तु** etc is a direct unambiguous emphatic statement, its force sublimates the force of all those texts in whatever way they might be interpreted. Nor is it to be questioned that the singularity of the Mahāvākya yields to the plurality of those other texts, for a thorough review of the various scriptures points to the fact that an emphatic statement of the paribhāṣā kind occurs only once or, at any rate, is repeated only a few times in a particular arena of texts. We are now in a position to synthesise the meaning thus established of the particular texts with the general purpose of the Mahāvākya, and thereby vehemently assert that Kṛṣṇa according to the Bhāg. view is not a mere Incarnation but the Absolute Being Himself; and, because from our standpoint the supreme authoritativeness of the Bhāgavata lords it over the various other scriptures, Kṛṣṇa and nothing but Kṛṣṇa is the Ultimate Reality according to the true significance of the whole scripture.

Kṛṣṇa being thus positively declared as the Advaya Jñāna Tattwa, there is no doubt that all the characteristics of the concept of Advaya Jñāna Tattwa apply to Him; and to establish the cult of Kṛṣṇa on a sure basis we must explain this point elaborately following the same line of reasoning as before. What strikes us primarily in the concept of Advaya Jñāna Tattwa is that He is the Highest Being in whom the three Swarūpa Śaktis of Existence, Knowledge and Bliss have eternally attained the highest development. This fact is implied by the very name in its derivative sense. The word is derived from root **कृष** to "attract" with suffix **ण**. The function of a suffix in language is to establish that distinctive state or feature whereby the particular thing indicated by the derived word is distinguished from other things so as to posit itself in the midst of all differences. , Accordingly, in the present case the act of attraction is to be understood, by

means of the hyper-connotation of terms, as one which surpasses all other kinds of attraction, and the derived word means 'a Being that attracts all other beings in an all-surpassing way; and this all-surpassing power of attraction, as evidenced by our own experience, can be nothing but an all-surpassing pleasure or happiness. And, because Kṛṣṇa is the Absolute Being, His power of attraction is necessarily Infinite Bliss. Again by 'the act of attraction' we also mean that the various kinds of existence of the things attracted are located to a certain point which therefore is regarded as the common source of existence. Thus by the same hyper=connotative function of terms in the present case the attracting Being is surely to be understood in the sense of 'one as the source of all existences', in other words, Eternal Existence is clearly implied. That the attribute of Infinite Knowledge is necessarily involved in Bliss has been explained previously and is testified to by all psychology. Evidently, therefore, the very name indicates that He is a Being in whom all the three Svārūpa Śaktis have eternally attained the highest development, and this is what the Vṛhat Goutamīya Tantra describes as—**कृपि भूवाचकः शब्दः एव निर्वृतिवाचकः । तयोरेकं परं ब्रह्म कृष्ण इत्यभिधीयते । सत्तास्वानन्दयोर्योगात् चित् परं ब्रह्म चोच्यते ॥**

We further come to know from various texts, e. g. **सच्चिदानन्दरूपाय कृष्णायक्लिष्टकारिणे** (Goṣāla Tāpanī Śruti), **इश्वरः परमः कृष्णः सच्चिदानन्दविग्रहः** (Brahma Saṃhitā, 1st verse), that the three attributes mentioned above constitute the very body of Kṛṣṇa, and this at once disposes of the fact that Kṛṣṇa is not like an ordinary being having the body made up of the sensuous elements.

The fact that there is no difference in function between

the different limbs of the body of Kṛṣṇa, in other words, what is signified by the Śruti text सर्वतः पाणिपादं तत् सर्वतोऽक्षिशिरो-
मुखम् । सर्वतः श्रुतिमल्लोके सर्वमावृत्य तिष्ठति ॥ (Śvet. 3, 18, & Gītā 13, 13) can be thus illustrated from the Bhāgavata texts—In the course of His manifest beatific sports in His own blissful supersensuous heaven, Kṛṣṇa made (is eternally making) the sport of dining in the company of His divine associates—the Gopas. Although He then occupied the central seat, being surrounded on all sides by the associates, yet each one of them equally and simultaneously realised that Kṛṣṇa faced him, talked with him, touched him, and the like; at the same time each one of them realised Him in His own intrinsic form of a supersensuous man having two hands, two feet, one face etc.; and none of them perceived Him in his 'partial manifest having endless hands, endless feet, endless faces, endless senses'. Such a state of things, beyond the conception of the understanding, is possible only if each and every bit of His body performs simultaneously the functions of all the senses, and constitutes one of the reasons why He transcends all other beings.

The intrinsic form similar to that of a human being, which is stated above as eternally realised by His associates, requires an elaborate explanation, and we can do it in no better way than by referring to the Śruti texts. The Gopāla Tāpanī Śruti clearly describes Him as having the form and dress of a Gopa, with complexion like that of a surcharged cloud, ever young, with eyes like full-bloomed lotuses, wearing a cloth yellow like lightning and a vanamālā on.

Kṛṣṇa as Bhagavān might appropriately be described as the Absolute of all absolutes. The reason is not far to seek. Indeed the conception of the Absolute is not restric-

ted to Vaiṣṇava religion alone, but common to all the different religious systems prevailing in the world. Yet there is a good deal of difference between the Vaiṣṇava conception of the Absolute and others. For, as far as can be gathered from the religious theories, the various concepts of the Absolute, inspite of a difference in minute details, agree in one point, viz, the Absolute is that in which endless infinite powers have eternally attained the highest development. The highest development of powers means the highest development of love, which again consists in the fact that the manifestation of powers or lordships by the Absolute is always guided by a charming grace, and this guiding force of charming grace when carried to the farthest extent constitutes the super-excellence of the loving-character of the Absolute. Such is preeminently the character of Kṛṣṇa as evidenced by Bhāgavata texts. Again, self-realisations in the shape of attainment of release from worldly sufferings is the summum bonum of all other religious theories, and with them, even with the Christian theory which bears a considerable resemblance to the Vaiṣṇava theory, this summum bonum is possible when in the mundane existence all the acts of the individual, all his outward manifestations of the thinking principle, are directed sympathetically towards the Loving God. In the V. Theory, on the other hand, we find such a wonderful charming lordship in Kṛṣṇa that He grants Release even to those demoniac beings like Pūtānā, Śiṣupālā, Kaṁṣā & others whose whole life of acts was a wide expanse of hostility towards Kṛṣṇa. For this latter fact He is preeminently called Bhagavān, as the author of the Charitāmṛta rightly observes—'Mādhuryya constitutes, the highest essence and differentia of the concept of Bhagavan'. It is to be noted in this connection that the guiding force of Mādhuryya is present in Kṛṣṇa as revelling in beatific sports in His own supersensuous heaven called Mathurā, Dwārakā

and Goloka or Vṛndāvana, and even here a gradation in display is to be understood. the guiding force attaining the fullest display in His sports in Goloka or Vṛndāvana. Hence it is that in the Kṛṣṇa of Vṛndāvana there is the highest aspect of intrinsic Kṛṣṇaism which is the highest object of worship in the Bhakti cult. When, again, we come to the concept of Kṛṣṇa as the Lord of Vaikuṇṭha (i.e. Nārāyaṇa), what we find? The graceful charm is now suppressed by lordship which becoming predominant, Kṛṣṇa here, though in the highest display of His Swarūpa Śaktis quite unconcerned with the display of His Vahiraṅga Śakti—Māyā, appears not in the human form as described above, but in the form of a Being having four hands and insignalia different from Kṛṣṇa the son of Nanda.

On account of the fullest extent of the guiding force of charming grace in lordship, Kṛṣṇa, being the Highest Person, is, as indicated above, superior even to Nārāyaṇa the Lord of Vaikuṇṭha. Not only this, there are endless Vaikuṇṭhas and endless Nārāyaṇas, but Kṛṣṇa is one and one only—the primeval Lord of all the Nārāyaṇas. This, as we come to know from the Bhāg. texts, He manifested in His līlā of Brahma-moḥana, His līlā of manifesting to Yaśodā the Viśwarūpa, and many other līlās. And so the bhāg. text asserts—*नामयणोऽङ्गं नरभूजलयनात्* (X, 14-14) which means that Nārāyaṇa is but His partial manifestation, He Himself being the highest Substance.

If Kṛṣṇa is thus the Advaya Jñāna Tattva or Bhagavān, it must be shown on the evidence of the Bhāg. texts that in Him all contradictions are conquered, in other words, what the Upaniṣad says viz, that the Absolute is simultaneously great and small, limited and unlimited, without qualities and with qualities, and so on, must be shown to apply to

Him. We have already said that Kṛṣṇa in his intrinsic selfhood is of a human form with two hands, feet etc; yet in His manifest sports He showed to His mother Yaśodā how the entire universe, the endless Nārāyaṇas, the endless Vaikunṭhas, His constant divine associates, His own supersensuous dwelling place and everything else are contained within His little face. What this sport signifies is that though He is intrinsically of a human form and so limited, yet at the same moment He is all-pervading; though a little child, yet the biggest being beyond conception; though sporting like a baby, yet with the highest lordships ever conceivable.

In a similar way, by referring to various other beatific sports as illustrated in the Bhāg. texts it can be clearly shown that Kṛṣṇa is Bhagavān or Advaya Jñāna Tattva. From the standpoint we have taken, viz, the supreme authoritativeness of the Bhāgavata, it seems to be needless to elaborate any further in view of the direct emphatic assertion in the Mahāvākya already referred to. And it is needless simply because it is impracticable to do so within the scope of the present treatise. Yet we are quite conscious of the fact that about the cult of Kṛṣṇa there are regrettable misconceptions in the minds of many, and we shall try to remove them as far as lies in our power.

Thus, in the first place, about the form, body, dress etc of Kṛṣṇa:—As we have already said, Kṛṣṇa, according to the Bhāgavata cult, in His intrinsic self-hood is of a human form, body, dress, acts etc which are all suitable to the nature of His eternal beatific sports like a human being, as is evident from the texts गूढं परं ब्रह्म मनुष्यालिङ्गम्, यन्मर्त्यलीलौपयिकम् etc already referred to. This point has already been briefly indicated by reference to various Śruti text, e. g. the Gopāla Tāpanī

Śruti which clearly describes Him as having the form and dress of a Gopa, with complexion like that of a surcharged cloud, ever young, with eyes like full-bloomed lotuses, wearing a cloth yellow like lightning and a vanamālā. We are afraid there is a general misconception about the true meaning of the several terms used here. The word "Gopa" in saṁskṛt ordinarily means a cowherd. And from the Idealistic-Realistic stand point which Vaiṣṇava Philosophy adopts in explaining the theory of the Bhāgavata cult it must be admitted that the Absolute Being Kṛṣṇa who eternally revels in ecstatic sports similar to those found in human beings really possesses the form of body and dress similar to that of a cowherd. But we should carefully remember the important fact that the similarity is in respect of form only and not of ingredient. A cowherd's body is solely made up of the ingredients of five sensuous decaying elements, not at all so in the case of Kṛṣṇa. He being Rāsa embodied, His body is solely made up of Infinite Bliss. His supersensuous body is the eternal reservoir and sustainer of Supreme Bliss, and it is He who in His partial manifest preserves and sustains the whole universe of beings; it is He who is gracious enough to part with a bit of His Infinite bliss whereby the whole universe of devotees—the endless manifestations and incarnations in the spiritual hierarchy, as well as the souls free from all fetters—enjoy supreme bliss which is kept up and barred from cessation simply by Him alone. We are gradually, therefore, led to the derivative sense of the word गोप which comes from root गुप् to preserve or sustain.

His complexion is generally compared to that of a cloud. There is however a want of clearness on this point.

The saṁskṛt word for this colour is श्याम, which again is differently interpreted by different expounders of the system. Most of the expounders say it is dark-blue, while others including Jīva Goswāmī take it to mean the colour of a flower called अतसी which is perhaps a mixture of the three colour of white, yellow and green. This want of clearness in the description of the complexion is indeed unavoidable, and the slight discrepancy on the point is to be explained away; for in the exact description of the Absolute Kṛṣṇa Language feels tired of its inability and ashamed of its own paucity even the Logos lags behind in utter despondency and incapacity. Whatever the complexion might be, it bears a resemblance in the midst of transcendental difference to any of the sensuous colours in the universe; it is a complexion which, being an eternal transformation of His Infinite Bliss and graceful charm alone, with its sanative magnetism, attracts all beings that are restless with an insatiable hankering and fervent devotion. And so we virtually get at the derivative sense of the word 'श्याम' which means "that towards which the mind is directed if there is a hankering after pure bliss" (श्यायने गच्छति मनोऽस्मिन्निति श्यामः—Vāchaspatya).

✓ Kṛṣṇa again is represented as inseparably associated with the flute or murali. To understand the true philosophic significance of this murali we are to remember the fact that, as taught in the Bhagavadgītā and the Bhāgavata, Vaiṣṇavism is to be regarded as spiritual syntheticism or the synthesis of all the different religious theories of the Hindus. Accordingly, the flute or murali is to be regarded as the symbol through which the Kṛṣṇa cult expresses its genius. Now it is a patent fact that the world-religion is taught in

different ways—in parables, pictures, sūtras and songs. And what is a song? It may be regarded as a great synthesis of sounds. So Kṛṣṇa taught through music. He brought with Him the unparalleled music of the muralī, and through that music He Himself experienced and made others experience a rich synthesis of life.) Synthesis, again, being ever preceded by thesis and antithesis is nothing but a reconciliation of all differences. From the Bhāg. texts in the Rāsa līlā chapter (X 29) we know that the Gopīs are brought together by nothing short of the matchless music of the muralī. The Gopīs again are the different supersensuous embodiments of love and sympathy, of pleasure and calmness, of ideal devotion to the Absolute Kṛṣṇa. All these differences in the shape of the Gopīs are harmoniously reconciled by the sweet power of the music of the flute. In the bringing together of the different Gopīs to the one blissful contiguity of Kṛṣṇa, we find nothing but the highest syntheticism—the synthesis of all differences. And because the greatest synthesis of differences is possible only by bliss, the whole ingredient of the muralī is bliss.

✓ Kṛṣṇa is ever young inasmuch as He is beyond the limitations of time and space. This eternal youth indicates further that herein there is the fullest display of the three swarūpa Śaktis, and that His blissful nature is such that its realisation gives the fervent devotee a supreme pleasure that always appears as fresh and never creates in him a feeling of satiety—the more a devotee realises such pleasure the greater hankering he gets after it.

In a similar way it can be shown that all the constituent elements of the supreme body of Kṛṣṇa are absolutely distinct from the sensuous body, they being nothing but the different manifestations of His own bliss.

The Śruti goes further to say—“कृष्णो हि परमं दैवतम्”.

Now the word दैवत comes from root दिव् meaning ‘to shine with lustre,’ ‘to make sports’. This eternal infinite lustre of His supersensuous blissful body is, as we have already stated, Brahman the Non-differenced Substance as conceived by the pure-monistic theory of the Vedānta. And the fact of the eternal revelling in beatific sports is necessarily connected with the idea of associates, a definite dwelling place and so on.

In consistency with the clear concept of Bhagavān these associates, this dwelling place, are, like the body, the senses, the dress and the like, nothing but the highest attribute of Bliss eternally deified. Evidences of such deification of attributes are not wanting in Up. texts. Indeed according to the theory of Vaiṣṇava Philosophy just as Kṛṣṇa is the divine embodiment of the endless attributes concentrated in Bliss and taken collectively, so the requisites for the eternal beatific sports of Kṛṣṇa are the embodiments of these attributes taken severally; and the relation between Kṛṣṇa and each of the requisites is one of difference as well as non-difference. With this preliminary idea in mind nobody will ever doubt the fact that the different personalities like Yaśodā, Nandā, Rādhā, and others whom Kṛṣṇa acknowledged as His mother, father, consort, friend and the like are not like ordinary human cowherds but absolutely different from them in as much as their souls are eternally unaffected by mundane existence, and, like their souls, their bodies, senses and everything are consisting of pure chit—unalloyed rationality. It is no doubt true that these divine personalities, as appears from the Bhāg. texts, were (or strictly speaking are) possessed of the sixfold passions as we find in phenomenal beings, but these passions, entirely based as they were upon

their steadfast adherence to Kṛṣṇa, were simply apparent. Kṛṣṇa manifested His sports in the phenomenal world once in every yuga, the cycle going on eternally; and to be associates in such sports, those divine personalities can not but act like human beings and so appear to be affected with human passions.

From the Bhāg. texts it appears that Kṛṣṇa during His manifest sports in this Brahmāṇḍa of which the earth we live on is a part, first appeared amongst the viṣṇis by way of acknowledging Vasudeva and Devakī as His parents. Now who are this Vasudeva and Devakī? The Bhāg. texts सत्त्वं विशुद्धं वसुदेवशब्दितम् etc (IV, 3, 21), and देवक्यां देवरूपिण्याम् (वसुदेवरूपिण्याम्, X, 3, 8) clearly describe them as consisting of pure chit as indicated above. The same idea occurs also in the Atharv. Up. texts—देवकीं ब्रह्मविद्या सा या देवैरूपगीयते । निगमो वसुदेवो यो वेदार्थः कृष्णरामयोः ॥

Though eternal associates of Kṛṣṇa in His beatific sports, their status in respect of devotion to the Lord, however, is lower than that of the Gopīs, Yaśodā and others. Hence it is that Kṛṣṇa first manifested to them not His intrinsic self in the form of a Gopa but the next lower aspect i.e. a human form with four hands and instruments necessary for overpowering tyrannous oppression and sin—a form that inspires awe and reverence. Subsequently, however, He assumed His own intrinsic form of a human being with two hands, and not willing to stay there long in this form allowed Himself to be taken to the place of Nanda and Yaśodā. From such manifestation of the awe-inspiring form in the first place and subsequent transformation of that form into one similar to that of an ordinary mortal man, the only plausible inference

that can be drawn is that Kṛṣṇa as Vāsudeva is not identical with Kṛṣṇa as Nandanandana, but a partial manifestation of the latter in which the graceful charm as the guiding principle in Lordship is displayed to the highest extent. Hence also in the Gītā texts while describing His own vibhūti Kṛṣṇa Himself says that He is the Vāsudeva amongst the viṣṇis (वृष्णिनां वासुदेवोऽस्मि).

The highest stage of manifestation—the manifestation of Kṛṣṇa as Kṛṣṇa in his fullest splendour of ecstatic Bliss—we find in the place of Nanda and Yaśodā. Being attracted by a higher and purer feeling of love (purer because unmixed with that reverence and awe and consequent stinctas was present in the case of Devakī) He liked to be nurtured as a child by Yaśodā. By the रूढि वृत्ति of words therefore Kṛṣṇa means 'one that has the complexion and lustre like that of a Tamāla tree and ever sucks the breast of Yaśodā (cf. तमालश्यामलन्विवि श्री-यशोदास्तनन्धये । कृष्णनाम्नो रूढिरिति सर्वशान्त्रविनिर्णयः ॥—Nāmakowmudī) The Ātharvanopaniṣad most appropriately describes Nanda as Paramānanda or devotional love embodied, and Yaśodā as Mukti-gehinī (नन्दः परमानन्दः यशोदा मुक्तिगेहिनी) where मुक्तिगेहिनी literally means housewife in the sphere of self-realisation, i. e., the state of concentration of that chit of which the positment as such is called Mukti according to the Achintya Bhedābheda theory of the Vedānta'.

The devotional love of Yaśodā towards the Absolute Being was so very great that Kṛṣṇa in His manifest sports could not but acknowledge her as His mother—could not but be nurtured by her, without entering into her body and

then being delivered as a child.' In the case of His partial manifestation as Vāsudēva, however, He did enter into the body of Devakī, but not in the way as a mortal being enters into the womb of a woman, but by way of clinging to her mental region and then manifesting Himself to the phenomenal beings, by way of making it appear as if He was born in the womb of Devakī; and such acts He cannot but display, since His eternal sports are similar to those of a human being.

From what is stated above it is quite evident that the dwelling place of Kṛṣṇa as Kṛṣṇa is also not to be confused with the phenomenal world; nor is it to be restricted to the heart of individuals alone as is erroneously stated by many modern preachers and teachers of the Bhāgavata cult. Indeed, as we have already stated, the heart of individual beings is a dwelling place of Bhagavān not as Bhagavān but in His partial manifest—the व्यष्टि-तयामि पुरुष. The dwelling place proper of Kṛṣṇa is entirely made up of pure chit or supersensuous element, and stands to Kṛṣṇa in the relation of difference and nondifference. From the Bhāgavata, Brahmasaṁhitā, Padma Purāṇa and various Śruti texts we know that it is styled Goloka or Gokula or Vṇḍāvana. Gokula is synonymous with Vṇḍāvana, and this and Goloka are different only from the point of view of manifest or non-manifest sports. In other words, Kṛṣṇa is eternally manifesting His ecstatic sports in the divine region called Goloka; and during the end of the Dwāparayuga when He graciously made His sports manifest to the phenomenal world, He no doubt manifested Himself as sporting in the midst of associates in the region Goloka which then is styled Vṇḍāvana. Both the kinds of sports are no doubt eternal as will be elaborately dealt with later on.¹

1. See appendix

It is to be carefully noted in this connection that while manifesting His sports to the phenomenal world, just as He by His own inconceivable power put a limitation to Himself, so consequently the Infinite Region proper of His own became limited as it were by the same power of Kṛṣṇa: yet the same region though thus limited is simultaneously all-pervading or unlimited. This point is quite evident from those Bhāg. texts (X, 13) which deal with Kṛṣṇa's sport of effecting, with the ultimate object of removing, the delusion of Brahmā when the latter had stolen away the supersensuous cows in charge of the Supreme Cowherd. As an act of divine grace towards the self-conceited ignorant Brahmā and with the object of positing His own supreme lordship, Kṛṣṇa, by a mere fiat of His will, showed to Brahmā how He, a little cowherd boy as He is, is the sole independent master of endless Vaikunthas. Indeed all these marvellous feats did take place within the sphere of Vrajmaṇḍala apparently covering only a few miles of space, and thereby it is clearly indicated how the supersensuous region—the abode of the Absolute Being, though limited in space, is yet the unlimited universe at the same time.

From the above account of Vṛndāvana it evidently follows that like Kṛṣṇa the Infinite Being His supreme region is necessarily Infinite. As such the supersensuous heaven Vṛndāvana is not to be confused with the phenomenal Vṛndāvana which we ordinarily perceive with our gross senses. It is no doubt true that towards the end of the Dwāparayuga Kṛṣṇa manifested His sports to the then inhabitants of this part of the country, but it is to be carefully noted that the Infinite supreme region then interlapped with this phenomenal region. It also follows from the same fact that because Infinite it pervades the whole universe of beings—the modern geogra-

phical Vṛndāvana not excluded, and consequently can be realised subject to certain conditions by any being to whatever point of the universe he might be located. Vṛndāvana, in other words, might be described as the Ideal world just as Kṛṣṇa is the Ideal Being. It is the Ideal world which is eternally realised by Kṛṣṇa along with His associates including the released souls, and wherein this world of ours ultimately finds its real meaning and truth. By calling it Ideal we do not mean that its existence is solely created by or restricted to the mind, nor is it to be understood as the universal spiritual experience of the race as some critics might urge. It is surely the Real world ever retaining its our supreme reality irrespectively of the spiritual experience of the individual or the general mind, and can be realised only by that devotional spirit which gives rise to an uninterrupted flow of ideas. It is, in short, the Ideal-Real world and is such that it cannot be adequately described in words.

We think we have sufficiently shown from the evidence of the Bhāg. texts that Kṛṣṇa is not an Incarnate Being, but Himself is Bhagavān. We are convinced also that for the purpose of those to whom the supreme authoritativeness of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa is a matter of simple faith no other statement on this point need be made. But there are many who, for many reasons, want more evidence for their satisfaction. Our next attempt, therefore, will be to show that the theory thus stated in the Bhāg. texts tallies with that of the various scriptural texts of the Hindus—e.g. the Gītā, the Upanisads, and the Vedas.

Let us first examine the Gītā texts:—

On the Ved. Sūtra असद्व्यपदेशाच्चेति चेन्न धर्मान्तरेण वाक्यशेषात् (11. 1, 17) Śaṅkara, like other commentators, states that the real meaning of the word असत् in the Śruti text असदेवेदमग्र आसीत् is not absolute non-existence (of the effect) but non-existence in the sense of non-manifest existence, the reason being that such meaning viz "existence" (though qualified by a particular epithet e. g. 'without name and form') of the effect" is involved both in the introductory text and in the concluding passage. From this it appears that according to all the expounders of the Vedānta system—Śaṅkara included, there must always be an agreement in sense between the उपक्रम (beginning) and the उपसंहार (concluding passage) of all scriptural texts. Accordingly, the true interpretation of the Bhagavad-Gītā consists in showing that the significance of the concluding passages agrees with that of the beginning texts—that is to say, in showing that what is stated as a mere proposition in the beginning is established by way of argumentation in the concluding passages. Thus towards the beginning of the Gītā it is stated that Kṛṣṇa finding Arjunā to grieve for the dead relatives exposes his unwisdom, and for the removal thereof He begins to state the real truth in the verse अशोच्यान् अन्वशोचस्त्वम् etc, which, being elaborated by way of various argumentations throughout the intervening chapters, is established on a sound basis in the last chapter in the final text सर्वधर्मान् परित्यज्य मामेकं शरणं व्रज । अहं त्वां सर्वपापेभ्यो मोक्षयिष्यामि मा शुचः ॥

That the verse अशोच्यान् etc is really the beginning of the statement of philosophical and religious truths appears

from the verse in the 18th chapter viz—स्वभावजेन कौन्तेय !
निबद्धः स्वेन कर्मणा । कर्तुं नेच्छसि यन्मोहात् करिष्यस्यवशो-

अपि तत् ॥ which means that though Arjuna, even possessed of military prowess natural to a warrior caste, is, owing to his delusion, not willing to do the act of fighting, yet he must do it because his will depends upon the will of some other Being e.g. the Paramātmā Puruṣa. In the verses that follow it is clearly stated how devotion in the shape of complete resignation to Kṛṣṇa Himself is the highest esoteric teaching of the Gītā, which far surpasses in excellence all other modes of devotion to the different manifestations of Him. Accordingly Kṛṣṇa says to Arjuna— “It is Īśvara or Paramātmā Puruṣa that pervades the whole universe as the Immanent Regulator, and residing in the heart of all beings incites them to action through the instrumentality of His own Māyā Śakti. If you can wholly resort to Him, and the thought that He is present in the heart of all beings of the universe engrosses completely all your organs—sense organs as well as the organs of action, then you will be able to attain Bhakti towards me and reside in eternal heaven.” The truth herein contained is described as गुह्यतर or more esoteric; and the suffix तरप् in गुह्यतर evidently indicates that it is higher than something else. For, in the preceding passages centring round the verse ब्रह्मभूतः प्रसन्नः प्रसन्नः etc, a statement has been made about realisation of Brahman in the Nirviśeṣa state, and now in the present verses is distinctly stated that such realisation is a lower stage in comparison with ‘Realisation of Bhagavān as Paramātmā Puruṣa’. Yet this is not the highest realisation, and as such cannot appeal to the heart of a

fervent devotee like Arjuna. So thinking Kṛṣṇa goes on to disclose to His dear Arjuna the highest secret of Religion that consists in the practice of the Bhakti cult, and says—"Let your mind, your thought, your prayer and devotion, your sacrifice, in short, whatever acts you are to do—let all this turn towards me, and thereby you will be able to attain me even, far be it said of my different manifestations. This is the highest secret of Religion, and this I am telling you because you are found to be possessed of constant faith in me. Forsaking all sacraments, resort wholly to me, and I will save you from all transgression". The underlying truth in these texts no doubt is that fervent devotion, complete resignation, insatiable hankering after Kṛṣṇa is the highest truth of Religion, higher even than the realisation of Nārāyaṇa who is regarded as the Absolute Idea in many sects of Vaiṣṇavism. What we generally call Dharma indeed applies also to many forms of duty we are to do from the point of view of different stages of life e.g. studenthood, household life and the like; it applies in the same manner to the various kinds of duty we are to do as citizens, as members of a society, as belonging to a community, or in many other capacities; but the cult of Bhakti or fervent devotion to Kṛṣṇa lies far above all these; nay, to be devoted to Kṛṣṇa even at the sacrifice of all these minor duties causes no transgression whatsoever. What we really come to know from these various arguments is that Kṛṣṇa is the Ultimate Reality or Bhagavān; and that He is far above even Nārāyaṇa appears from the word सर्वगुह्यतमम्. The simple superlative form गुह्यतम would have been quite sufficient for the author to indicate the excellence and superiority of Kṛṣṇa over His partial manifestations—Brahman or Paramātmā; but still he has purposely used the additional word

सर्व simply to signify that Kṛṣṇa as Nanda's son is above even

Nārāyaṇa who appears as the Ultimate Reality in the system of Viśiṣṭādvaitavāda as exposed by Rāmānuja and others—which no doubt gives rise to one sect of Vaiṣṇava Religion. The one truth therefore which runs throughout the Gītā texts is what we have already established as the underlying theme of the Bhāgavata and other scriptural texts. The Gītā, again, is described in the Mahābhārata as सर्वशास्त्रमयी or containing in a nutshell the truths that are to be found in all other scriptural texts of the Hindus; thereby also we are in a position to assert that, directly or indirectly, all the sacred books of the East, if properly understood, teach us the one lustrous truth that Kṛṣṇa is the Ultimate Reality.

There is one more point about the Gītā which remains to be discussed. We are to show whether Kṛṣṇa appearing in the Gītā texts is of a body similar to that of a human being in form. From the eleventh chapter we know that to Arjuna Kṛṣṇa first manifested His Vi-varūpa—the form in which He possesses endless limbs and contains within Himself the infinite universe. This manifestation however did not appeal to the heart of a devotee like Arjuna. He was struck with awe; and though he was pleased to see this form never before seen by him, yet his mind wanted more. To a fervent devotee nothing is so relishing and delightful as the loving nature and form of the Absolute. Kṛṣṇa was conscious of it, yet He did this simply to test the devotion of Arjuna and to have it indicated that the Vi-varūpa is but His manifestation. The devotional spirit of Arjuna compelled Kṛṣṇa to appear before him in his intrinsic form. The emperor of a vast territory might appear before a large assembly of tutelary kings and subjects in the form of a crowned personage holding the royal

staff and decorated in gaudy dress, but this very person when going into the harem is forced by the pure and simple affection of his child to leave off all dress, to quit the royal staff, and then to appear in his loin cloth alone. Kṛṣṇa is of course indifferent to all the effects of His Māyā Śakti, indifferent to the diverse differences of his beings in respect of status or position, indifferent to the state of happiness or misery—but there is only one thing which shakes off His indifference—and that is the devotional love of His beings. And so Kṛṣṇa, strictly speaking, Kṛṣṇa as Vāsudeva manifested to Arjuna His own intrinsic form as appears from the text इत्यर्जुनं वासुदेवस्तथोक्त्वा स्वकं रूपं दर्शयामास भूयः. Some commentators erroneously state that this स्वरूप of Kṛṣṇa refers to His Viśwarūpa; but that this is the चतुर्भुज रूप of Kṛṣṇa—the form similar to a human being with the one difference of having four instead of two hands—is clear from the verse that follows—दृष्ट्वेदं मानुषं रूपम् etc. Others again assert that Arjuna was able to see the स्वरूप of Kṛṣṇa, because he was then endowed with a sight like that of the heavenly gods. This indeed is a childish talk. There are lots of texts e.g. तदभिर्न ब्रह्माद्वयं शिष्यते, स एव नित्यात्मसुखानुभूत्या व्युदस्तनायः (Bhāg.), ब्रह्मणो हि प्रतिष्ठाहम्, नाहं प्रकाशः सर्वस्य योगमायाम्मावृतः (Gītā), which, being considered together, distinctly show that the intrinsic form of Kṛṣṇa can be realised by nothing short of devotional spirit—such realisation is not at all possible even for the gods unless they have got the grace of Bhakti; and this is unambiguously stated in the verse—

सुदुर्दशमिदं रूपं दृष्टवानसि यन् मम । देवा अप्यस्य रूपस्य नित्यं दर्शनकाङ्क्षिणः (XII, 52). Our conclusion, therefore, is that in

the Gītā texts Kṛṣṇa appears not in the form of Nanda's son in the dress of a Gopa and nurtured as a child by Yaśodā, but in the form of the son of Devakī and Vasudeva, though of course both the forms are His intrinsic forms or Swarūpas. And it is to be distinctly noted in this connection that Kṛṣṇa as Vāsudeva might be the object of worship and devotion for one sect of Vaiṣṇava Religion still in vogue in southern India, but Kṛṣṇa as the object of worship with the Bengal sect is far above that—a point which will be discussed in detail later on.

Kṛṣṇa the Absolute, as evidenced by Upaniṣad and Vedic Texts:—

The best evidence on this point is supplied by the Gopāla Tāpanī Upaniṣad belonging to the Atharva Veda. Thus in the beginning while enquiring into the Highest Reality it states that Kṛṣṇa is the Highest, self-luminous Being to be always worshipped—the Being from whose knowledge necessarily follows the knowledge of all beings, which being known every thing else is known, and which is the source of the entire universe, and which dispells all fear of death (कः परमो देवः, कुतो मृत्युर्विभेति, कस्य विज्ञानेनाखिलं विज्ञातं भवति केनेदं विश्वं संसरति इति । कृष्णो वै परमं दैवतम्). The same idea is expressed also

in the concluding passage or upasamhāra vākya “तस्मात् कृष्ण एव परो देवस्तं ध्यायेत्तं रसयेत्तं यजेत् तं भजेदिति ॐ तत् सविति”)

“Therefore Kṛṣṇa is the self-luminous Being to be worshipped; meditate upon Him, propitiate Him with a view to attain the greatest bonum called Premānanda, sacrifice unto Him, be

always devoted to Him. He is the Prapāṇa, He is the Ultimate Reality."

Secondly, in the Kenopanishad the beginning verses, while enquiring by whose will the mind of the individual falls or withdraws (from the corporeal frame), state that 'tranquil minds, knowing full well that Being which is the Breath of all breath, the eye of all eyes, withdraw from this region and become immortal' (केनेपितं मनः पतति.....स उ प्राणस्य प्राण-
श्चक्षुश्चक्षु रतिमुच्य धीराः प्रेत्यास्माल्लोकादमृता भवन्ति In the intervening verses it is stated "Know that Being to be Brahman" (तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि) In the concluding passages we find again the statement "Whoever knows or realises this Upanishad attains immortality and the true sphere by way of overpowering all transgression, and establishes himself in the eternal heaven", (यो वा एतामेवं वेद अपहत्य पाप्मानमन्ते स्वर्गे लोके ज्येये प्रतितिष्ठति प्रतितिष्ठति।).

On a further enquiry as to who this Brahman is in a more definite way and what this eternal heaven is, the Nārāyaṇa Upanishad states at the outset that the Puruṣa Nārāyaṇa thought of creating beings. Some detailed accounts of creation are then given, which is followed again by the statement that Nārāyaṇa alone is the Eternal Selfluminous Being. Then follows an eulogy upon worshippers of Nārāyaṇa, after which is stated that Nārāyaṇa is that Brahman. In the concluding passages the eternal Heaven is described as a place which is round-shaped like a lotus, which is bliss-embodied and having complete lustre like that of lightning, and called Vaikuṇṭha (तदिदं पुरं पुण्डरीकं विज्ञानघनं तस्मात्तडिदाभमं चम्). The Lord of this

eternal Heaven is last described as Devakīputra (ब्रह्मण्यो देवकीपुत्रो ब्रह्मण्यो मधुसूदनः). The reconciliation of the Upakrama and Upasamhāra Vākyas is possible only if we say what we have already established viz that Kṛṣṇa the son of Devakī is Nārāyaṇa in the absolute sense, while Nārāyaṇa proper, the Lord of Vaikuṇṭha, is only a partial manifestation of Kṛṣṇa.

In the Atharvanopanisaḍ there is a text कश्च विष्णुः, परं ब्रह्मैव विष्णुः. On this the commentator Nārāyaṇa, though seemingly belonging to the school of Śaṅkara, says—Śrīkṛṣṇa alone is Viṣṇu, who is preeminently Bliss in form, who is lustrous (i. e. self-luminous), who is eternity embodied and who is the culminating point of summum bonum (अनन्दैकरूपतेजोमयामृतमयपरमार्थावधिभूतो विष्णुः श्रीकृष्ण एव) The expression परमार्थावधिभूतः means nothing but that all summum bonums—all the different concepts of the final end of life according to the different systems of philosophy—are rivetted in Kṛṣṇa, who is thus regarded as the Absolute even by a follower of the Jñāna Mārga of Śaṅkara. This fact is further corroborated by the text ऋतस्य गर्भं जनुयः पिपत्सन (Rg Veda 1, 156 3) which is thus explained by the commentator—"Know, Ye, that Para Brahman Kṛṣṇa who is eternally manifested as having blissful hands, feet etc, and who (in His manifest sports), takes birth (i. e. appears before the phenomenal world) in Devakī.

The eternity and supersensuous character of Kṛṣṇa's dwelling place which has been described as Goloka may be

proved also from the R̥g Vedic text “तां वां वास्तुन्युश्मसि ग-
मध्ये यत्र गावो भूरिशृङ्गा अयास अत्राह तदुदगायस्य वृष्णः परमं
पदमवभति भूरि ” The meaning is this—We desire (उश्मसि)
to go to those places (वास्तूनि) of the sports of you—Kṛṣṇa
and Rāma (वां), where there are auspicious cows of big horns.
It is said in the Vedas (आह) that that (तत्) supreme place
(the supremacy lies in the fact that the place far surpasses the
phenomenal world) of Him who is so greatly praised (उदगायस्य)
and who showers (whose lotus-like feet worshipped grant
all desires—वृष्णः), shines greatly in this phenomenal world.
Although in this text neither the word Kṛṣṇa—nor the word
Goloka is explicitly used, yet from the sense it is quite appa-
rent that the first half of the texts refers to Goloka—the place
of the non-manifest beatific sports of Kṛṣṇa, while the latter
half to Vṛndāvana the place of manifest sports, being insepa-
rably connected with which Kṛṣṇa appeared in the pheno-
menal world towards the end of the Dwāpara Yuga.

The same idea also occurs in the Mādhyandina Śākhā of
the Yajurveda, viz:—“य ते धामः युश्मसि विष्णो परमं पदमव-
भति भूरि” which means—We desire to go to that shining place,
the dwelling place of Viṣṇu.

In the R̥k Pāriśiṣṭa Śruti “राधया माधवो देवो मधवेनैव
राधिका, विभ्राजन्ते जनेष्वा” there is a clear reference to the
cult of Rādhā which will be explained later on. For the
present, however, the rendering of the text may be briefly
stated thus—Mādhava (Kṛṣṇa) eternally shines resplendent and

makes ecstatic sports by reason of Rādhā, and Rādhikā too shines amongst all people only in connection with Mādhava.

The text in the Chhā. Up. “कृष्णाय देवकीनन्दनाय” leads to the same conclusion. The Muṇḍaka text again “दिव्ये पुरे ह्येष संन्योम्यात्मा प्रतिष्ठितः” speaks of the ever-shining dwelling place of Kṛṣṇa, called Saṁvyoman or Paravyoman.

We have thus conclusively proved that Kṛṣṇa is the Absolute Being. The distinctive attributes whereby He is thus regarded as the Absolute have been nicely summed up by Valadeva Vidyā bhūṣaṇa in his Prameya Ratnāvalī—

“हेतुत्वाद् विभुचैतन्यानन्दत्वादि गुणाश्रयात् ।

नित्यलक्ष्म्यादिमत्वाच्च कृष्णः परतमो मतः ॥,¹

which means that Kṛṣṇa is the Absolute, because He is the hetu, the substratum of attributes such as विभुत्व, चैतन्य, आनन्द etc, and eternally associated with Lakṣmī. He is the uncaused cause of all beings, as is well said in the Śvet. Up-
एकः स देवो भगवान् वरेण्यो योनिस्वभावान् अधितिष्ठत्येकः (v, 4)

—“One alone without a second assistant, He is the self-luminous Absolute Lord, the most honoured and adorable of the universe, and the sole guiding force of all the secondary causalities like Mahat and others.” He is ever existent and all-pervading as the Kath. up says—महान्तं विभुमात्मानं मत्वा धीरो न शोचति (II, 22, IV, 4). Besides, Existence, Knowledge

-
1. The idea here is similar to that contained in the Bhag. text—
स्वयं त्वसाम्यातिशयस्यधीशः स्वाराज्यलक्ष्म्यास समस्त-
कामः । वर्ति हरद्भिश्चिरलोकपालैः किरीटकोद्येडितपादपीठः ॥
(III, 2, 21).

and Bliss are His attributes as the Vājasaney Up. says— “विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म रातिर्दातुः परायणम्”. In other words, the three main attributes, Sat, Chit and Ānanda constitute His supreme body or He is called Sachchidānanda-vigraha. His embodiedness is not contradictory to His all = pervadingness, as the Mundaka says—वृक्ष इव स्तब्धो दिवि तिष्ठत्येक स्तेनेदं पूर्णं पुरुषेण सर्वम् (III, 9)—“The highest Regulator of all beings, He, like a tree, is eternally present in His own supreme heaven Paravyoman and simultaneously the whole universe is pervaded by Him—the most perfect Being, and this is all due to His inconceivable potency.” The quality of Mādhuryya constitutes His differentia in-as-much as this in the fullest extent is ever present in Him alone and in no other Being. This Mādhuryya, again, briefly rendered into the Eng. equivalent “graceful charm” or “charming gracefulness”, is to be explained thus—“माधुर्य्यं ऐति, मनुष्यभावेनैव पारमैश्वर्य्यसाध्यकार्य्यकारित्वं तदित्यर्थः यथा स्तनचूषणेन पूतनाप्राणहरणं. कोमलांग्रिहत्या अनिकटोरशकटभङ्गः, सप्ताब्दिक्या मूर्त्या गिरिराजस्य धारणमित्यादि”—“The graceful charm consists in the fact that even in His human form and in the midst of performing blissful sports similar to those of a human being, He works wonders such as can be effected only by the highest lordliness, e. g., while sucking the breast of the demoness Pūtana, He destroyed her life immediately; by the stroke of His soft legs He upset and broke to pieces a very weighty cart; while yet a child of seven He held up on the end of His little finger the vast mountain Govardhana.” Again, the three main attributes though constituting the body of Kṛṣṇa are to be understood as really different as well as non-different from Kṛṣṇa the High-

est Substance or Entity; for the purpose of explaining the thing, they are indicated however in language in such a way that it appears as if there is a difference only, and this point is to be understood just in the same way as we say "Time always exists"—in which one and the same Time is indicated in twofold aspects involving an element of difference."

Just as Kṛṣṇa is the perfect Being, so are His incarnations; still there is some difference, and the difference is indicated in the Vāja. Texts—पूर्णमदः पूर्णमिदं पूर्णात् पूर्णमुदच्यते । पूर्णस्य पूर्णमादाय पूर्णमेवावशिष्यते ॥ "Kṛṣṇa is Pūrṇa, His Incarnation also is Pūrṇa; but for the purpose of a manifestation of the beatific sports, the Pūrṇa Incarnation comes out of Kṛṣṇa; and at the time of withdrawing the sports from the vision of a particular phenomenal world Pūrṇa Kṛṣṇa alone remains by way of inhabiting in His own selfhood the whole nature of the incarnations." We might say, in other words, that while the incarnations are Pūrṇa, Kṛṣṇa is Pūrṇatama (पूर्णतम)¹

-
1. In the above elaboration of the concept of Kṛṣṇa we have cited some Sṛuti texts in which the term Kṛṣṇa does not explicitly occur, and hence it might be doubted whether these texts really establish Kṛṣṇa as the Absolute Being Bhagavan. Without entering into a full discussion of the question of authenticity of these texts, we are inclined to say here this much only that ancient Vaiṣṇava Philosophers interpreted the texts in the way we have done, and that the concept of Kṛṣṇa has been traditionally supported by these amongst other texts. The text पूर्णस्य पूर्णमादाय etc., for example, has been interpreted by Madhwacharya as related to the text "स देवो बहुधा भूत्वा निर्गुणः पुरुषोत्तमः । एकीभूय पुनः शेते निर्दोषो हरिरादिकृत् ॥," and hence referring to the concept of Hari or Kṛṣṇa as the Ultimate Reality. (Bhasya, p. 15).

CHAPTER II.

THE PRINCIPLE OF RĀDHĀ.

Before we understand the principle of Rādhā which is the most vital point in Vaiṣṇava Religion—nay, which alone contributes to the excellence of the Bhakti cult, we have to recapitulate once more what we have already sufficiently discussed, viz, that the Absolute as conceived in Vaiṣṇava Philosophy is not a non-differenced substance, but the Highest substratum consisting of endless attributes or potencies eternally displayed to the fullest extent. Such a concept of the Absolute is the concept of Bhagavān which again is nothing but Kṛṣṇa. These endless potencies are classified first into Antaraṅgā or Parā, Vahiraṅgā or Aparā, and Tāṭasthā or Jīva Śakti. The Antaraṅgā or Swarūpa Śaktis are three, viz, Sandhinī Samvit and Hlādinī, while the Vahiraṅgā is called the Māyā Śakti. In Kṛṣṇas Kṛṣṇa there is the fullest display of the the three Swarūpa Śaktis, while Māyā is displayed by His partial manifest; consequently, Kṛṣṇa is Bhagavān in whom the three Śaktis are eternally displayed to the fullest extent. Although the idea of the fullest manifestation of the Śaktis cannot be separated from the principle of Bhagavān, yet for the facility of our understanding the character of the beatific sports of Bhagavān we may state that one and the same principle—the Highest principle or ultimate Reality—, when viewed from the point of view of the substratum, is styled Bhagavān and when from the point of view of the threefold attributes is called Mahālakṣmī. In other words, just as Bhagavān in the absolute sense is the supreme term for the Divinity of the substance having those attributes, so Mahālakṣmī is the supreme term for the Divinity of those attributes themselves. We are thus led to conclude that the endless attributes of Bhagavān may be viewed in their

two-fold aspects of Mahā Lakṣmī or the Antarāṅgā Mahā Śakti, and Vahiraṅgā Śakti. These two aspects have clearly been explained thus in the Bhāg. text—**श्रिया पुष्ट्या गिरा कान्त्या कीर्त्या तुष्ट्ये लयोर्जया । विद्यया विद्यया शक्त्या मायया च निवे-
दितम् ॥** (X, 39, 55) The text states only a few of the endless

emanations of the most generic Antarāṅgā Śakti Mahā Lakṣmī, and each of them has an additional import in being also an emanation of the Vahiraṅgā Śakti. Thus the word श्री means divine splendour or the halo of glory of Bhagavān, and also means worldly splendour or glory which has such an attractive influence that it is loath to forsake even one who has lost almost all attachment to phenomenal objects. ^१ Līlā means the world as force from the point of view of Māyā Śakti; it also means the Līlā Śakti of Bhagavān which will be explained later on. The word Avidyā viewed as an emanation of the Māyā Śakti means that force (of which the function is to effect the concealment and forgetal. (अचरण्णात्मिका) of the true nature of the individual, and the identification thereof with sensuous matter; viewed in the other aspect, it means that supersensuous or divine potency whereby is effected that ecstatic joy (प्रेमानन्द) which consists in the suppression of the lordship of Bhagavān and positment of dear personal relationships between Him and the devotee. The latter import of the word Avidyā,¹ although it might appear novel to the

-
1. The word Avidyā being interpreted in the above way, viz, in the sense of suppression of the lordship which is the effect of the Chit or Samvit, virtually gives the idea of Avidyā आ सम्यक् विद्या or chit developed to the fullest extent i. e., Bliss. Thus अविद्या becomes आविद्या, and thereby

school of Absolute Monism, is no doubt based upon the Śruti text गोपीजनाविद्याकलाप्रेरकः (Gopālā Tāpanī) which means nothing but that Kṛṣṇa as Rasa effects the niceties and delicacies of the emotional ecstatic love characterising the Gopas. In a similar way all the other words used in the complet may be shown to have twofold connotations from the point of view of the Mahā Lakṣmī and the Māyā Śakti of Bhagavān.

As has already been said, the intrinsic self-hood of Bhagavān lies in the fact that Himself being indifferent to the display of the Māyā Śakti which is indeed effected by his own partial manifest, He eternally revels in the fullest display of the threefold Swarūpa Śaktis—Sandhinī, Samvit and Hlādinī. These three Swarūpa Śaktis, as defined previously, eternally exist in Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa alone who is the highest Substratum of all beings; they do not exist extrinsically in the individual souls that are encased in corporeal frames. The latter as such or what the Charaka Saṃhitā describes as Puruṣas¹ are indeed

the confusion between this अविद्या and the अविद्या as the emanation of मया is removed.

1. cf. षड् धातवः समुदिताः पुरुष इति शब्दं लभन्ते तद् यथा पृथिव्यापस्तेजो वायुराकाशं ब्रह्म चाव्यक्तमित्येत एव च षड् धातवः समुदिताः पुरुष इति शब्दं लभन्ते (Śrīraṣṭhama, ch. v, 5) "Puruṣa (human personality) is regarded as the combination of six Dhatus viz the five elements and non-manifest Brahman" where the word Brahman has been used in the sense of the individual self for many reasons—(1) to indicate the analogy drawn in the lines that follow between the vibhūtis of the Highest Self as manifest in the phenomenal world and those manifest in a person, (2) to point out the similarity which a finite self bears to the Highest Self, (3) to indicate the fact that the finite self has got its creator in the

the substratums of the sensuous triad of Sattwa, Rajas and Tamas—the constituent elements of the material cause Pradhana which is but an emanation of the Vahiraṅgā or Māyā Śakti of Bhagavān.¹

Since the distinctive character of Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa—the Rasa of the Upaniṣad texts—consists in the revelling in beatific sports in the midst of the highest development of those three Śaktis which are concentrated in Bliss, eternal associates are indeed necessary for the purpose. These associates, as already pointed out, are therefore nothing but the divinities of the threefold Śaktis. Their existence, though eternal, is owing to the Sandhinī Śakti, in other words, relative to the absolute existence of Bhagavān; their consciousness of the Absolute Lordship of Kṛṣṇa is owing to the Saṅgīti; their contribution to the blissful sports of Kṛṣṇa as well as their own ecstatic joy is owing to the Bliss or Illādinī Śakti. The relation thus between Kṛṣṇa and the associates is one of difference and non-difference, or what Vaiṣṇava Philosophy calls Achintyabhedābheda; non-difference because they are but the attributes of the Ultimate Reality Kṛṣṇa, difference because they are eternally deified or supersensuously embo-

Highest Self and is intended for the sole good (pleasure) to Brahman, just in the same way as Mahat or Great Intellect has been described by Manu as Atma in vers. 15, ch. I.

1. It is to be noted here that the triad of Sattwa Rajas and Tamas does not affect Bhagavan in the least, and hence is to be carefully distinguished from the Swarupa Śakti—triad. To avoid confusion with the Sattva guṇa present in the phenomenal beings, Vaiṣṇava Philosophy gives the additional name of विशुद्ध सत्त्व or pure rīti (chit) unaffected with the Māyā Śakti to the Samvit Śakti of Bhagavan. [cf. सन्निदेव ज्ञानाज्ञानशक्तिः शुद्ध सत्त्वश्चेति द्वेयम्, Bhag. Sandarbha. n. 189].

died realities having each a distinct body of his own for the upkeep of the ecstatic sports of Kṛṣṇa. We cannot describe this relation in the light of Monism, Dualism or Pluralism, since the terminology or nomenclature of Western Philosophy does not strictly apply to Hindu Philosophy the modes of speculation being quite different.

These divinities of the Swarūpa Śāktis associate themselves in the ecstatic sports of Kṛṣṇa in different ways. Although the general character of their devotional love towards Kṛṣṇa is alike supersensuous as absolutely contradistinguished from the sensuous love that prevails amongst phenomenal beings, yet there is a gradation of various degrees in respect of niceties and delicacies in the manifestation of their divine love. Such gradation again goes *pari pasu* with the difference in the manifestation of Lordship by Kṛṣṇa. We have already explained how lordship yields to ecstatic bliss. We have also said that the highest essence of Bhagavān consists in the complete sublimation of lordship by the blissful and loving nature. And this complete sublimation is possible to be effected not by all the divinities of the Swarūpa Śāktis but by one and one only, and that select one is what Vaiṣṇava Philosophy calls Rādhā. Rādhā, therefore, is not to be described as an ordinary mortal milkmaid as we find in Indian village life. Rādhā's devotional love towards Kṛṣṇa such as justifies in any way the objectionable remark of Mr. Macdonnell who describes it as full of obscenities and impurities.¹

Just as Kṛṣṇa is that Being or Substance in whom the endless potencies are eternally displayed to the fullest extent, so is Rādhā representing those endless potencies themselves

1. See Macdonnell's History of Sanskrit Literature, the Chapter on Lyric poems.

in the fullest degree. In other words, Rādhā is no other than that Mahā Lakṣmī which has been described as the most generic Antarāṅgā Mahā Śakti of Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa. We may say therefore that the ultimate causality of the creation, sustentation etc of the entire universe lies in Rādhā. Rādhā is one with Kṛṣṇa in being wholly identified with the highest stage of the Hlādinī Śakti of Kṛṣṇa; yet she is different inasmuch as Kṛṣṇa for the purpose of beatific sports eternally manifests Himself in two different shapes of body. The relation, thus, between Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā is evidently one of difference as well as non-difference. By way of analogy may say that the relation is the same as that between nusk and its smell or between fire and its flames.

Rādhā, therefore, by the power of her devotion sublimates altogether the Lordship of Kṛṣṇa. This purpose is satisfied by Herself and her various emanations. These emanated divinities are the Gopīs of Vṛndāvana. Indeed the word Gopī (गोपी) comes from root गुप् to preserve. The ecstatic joy called Premānanda is preserved by them in heart, is concentrated in themselves to the fullest extent ever conceivable—hence they are called Gopīs. Rādhā is (gopī par excellence, while the others are like her Kāyavyūhas (कायव्यूह)¹.

1. This is according to the view of the Charitamṛta text—

आकारस्वभावभेदं ब्रजदेवीगणम् ।

कायव्यूहरूपं तान् रमेरकाणम् ॥

And it is to be noted here that the term कायव्यूह generally reminds one of the technical sense in which it is used in Yoga Philosophy (the meaning being 'a number of bodies which a Yogī can simultaneously generate by means of his occult power for the satisfaction of some purpose'). There is however a good deal of difference between that meaning and the idea in the present case, inasmuch as the bodies of a

They simply help in the complete positment of the astonishing beatitude by Rādhā. Bliss is the sole ingredient of their bodies, their senses and their mind—their everything. And Bliss necessarily involves Chit. So we find in the scriptural text—

आनन्दचिन्मयरसप्रतिभाविताभि-

स्तभिर्य एव निजरूपतया कलाभिः ।

गोलोक एव निवसत्यखिलात्मभूतो

गोविन्दमादिपुरुषं तमहं भजामि ॥

(Brahma Saṁhitā),

that the most primeval Being Govinda (Kṛṣṇa) being the Self of the entire universe of beings (in His partial manifest Paramātmā), in His intrinsic selfhood eternally dwells in the highest eternal heaven called Goloka, along with them (the Gopīs) who are but His Śāktis (कलाभिः) and whose whole person is perfused with Bliss and Chit, i.e., with Prema. Leaving a fuller discussion of the meaning of the word Prema for a separate chapter, it will suffice here to say that this is never to be confused with passion or sensuous love. The difference between the two cannot be better expressed than by saying that while (काम) is like deep abysmal darkness, Prema is like the bright solar lustre coming down from the sky completely unclouded. Kāma, in other words, is desire for the satisfaction of one's own senses, while Prema is desire solely for the pleasing of the Absolute Being Kṛṣṇa (Charitāmṛta).

In the hierarchy of the manifestations of the devotional love towards Kṛṣṇa, Rādhā represents the highest stage. The height of this love as well as a thorough exposition of all the

--

Yogi are decaying while those of the Gopīs are eternal. Hence it is but meet that the Gopīs are described as something like the Kayavyūhas of Rādhā, and not exactly the Kayavyūhas.

... is simply beyond conception; yet Vaisnava Philosophy—be it said to its credit—has tried to analyse with very great subtlety the various kinds of passion for Kṛṣṇā. It asserts that this passion passes from one stage to the other until it reaches the highest sublimity—the love manifested by Rādhā, in other words, the love manifested by the divinity of the highest potency of Bhagavān Himself. In consistency with the spiritual significance of Kṛṣṇa's beatific sports, the different grades in the manifestation of devotional love by the divinities of His Swarūpa Śaktis cannot but be analogous to the various classes of human relationship considered in their emotional aspect. A complete exposition of all these different shades of feeling is simply impracticable in the English language, the simple reason being that Western Philosophy could never think of this exhaustive classification.¹ However it is to be distinctly noted here that the significance of the analogy between the grades of divine love and the classes of human relationship lies in this that the latter has a much

-
1. By so saying we do not mean to depreciate the western methods of thinking, but to urge only that the character of philosophical speculation is guided to some extent by climatology. And so Dr. Grierson rightly observes in his Introduction to the Vidyapati—"God is Love" is alike the motto of the eastern and of the western worlds, while the form of love proposed is essentially different. The people of a colder western clime have contented themselves with comparing the ineffable love of God to that of a father to his children, while the warmer climes of the tropics have led the seekers after truth to compare the love of the worshipper for the worshipped to that of the Supreme Mistress Rādhā for her Supreme Lord Kṛṣṇa. It is true that it is hard for a western mind to grasp the idea, but let us not hastily condemn it."

greater and insistent demand upon the time and attention of a person than what the lip prayers of God require.

At a very low stage in this hierarchy of divine feelings, as manifested in Kṛṣṇa's beatific sports in Goloka or Vṛndāvan, the love exists as a relation between servant and master in the tie of obedience to the commandments of Kṛṣṇa. As the nature of the relation requires it, consciousness of the supreme Lordship of Kṛṣṇa very often peeps into the mind of the servant devotee who therefore often feels reserve in his attendance upon Kṛṣṇa. The feeling of awful reverence is greatly predominant over the feeling of simple love. The next higher stage is that of a friendly relation—as exemplified in the love of Suvala, Śrīdāma, Arjuna and others. Here also Lordship prevails though in a lesser degree. The Gītā teaches us that to Arjuna Kṛṣṇa first manifested His Viśwarūpa; this terrified Arjuna, filled him with a feeling of awe and reserve; yet his mind felt uneasiness and there was a good deal of hankering which compelled Kṛṣṇa to manifest His intrinsic form of a human being, but that not always.

The next higher stage is that in which a more personal relationship is brought about whereby Kṛṣṇa is conceived as a child and loved accordingly. This is best exemplified in the love of mother Yaśodā for Kṛṣṇa. Although Kṛṣṇa in His Prakata Līlā first acknowledged Devakī as His mother, yet He was attracted away by a purer and closer affectionate love and so liked to be nurtured as a child by Yaśodā. The simple affectionate love of Yaśodā cannot prevent her from punishing Kṛṣṇa for His childish freaks and naughty mischiefs. Her heart is filled with cares and anxieties when in the morning Kṛṣṇa goes out with the whole body of Gopas to look after the cattle. His home-coming is an event

of joy to her. Even this motherly love of Yaśodā is not powerful enough to sublimate altogether the Lordship of Kṛṣṇa. She is some times strack with the supernatural powers of her son; while suckling the baby Kṛṣṇa, she is astounded to see within the small cavity of His little face the entire universe of beings, the various incarnations, the endless Nārāyaṇas as the Lords of endless Vaikuṇṭhas, the eternal highest heaven along with the Gopas and Gopīs. Yet such manifestation of supreme Lordship is only temporary; again the motherly love gains the upper hand and mother Yaśodā banishes all these thoughts from her mind and is absorbed with cares and anxieties quite natural to a mother.

In the highest stage, viz, the stage of ecstasy of love, the most closest personal relationship of conjugal tie is brought about whereby Kṛṣṇa is loved with an unparalleled, all-pervading, all-absorbing, astounding passion by Rādhā and Her associate Gopīs. Here there is not the slightest tinge of reserve—no fear, no awful reverence, no shrinking, no hesitation, no uneasiness, no astounding, no bewilderment, nothing of the kind nothing whatsoever which breaks the incessant flow of devotion. Here all conventions are utterly discarded and the highest self in the nature is completely posited. The crimson love of Rādhā alone is more than a match for the supreme Lordship of Kṛṣṇa which is completely thrown into the background. The Bhāgavata texts and allied scriptures are unanimous on the point that Kṛṣṇa ever appears to Rādhā and to the Gopīs in His intrinsic form of द्विभुज गोपवेश वेणुकर, and never in the form of one having four hands but otherwise human-shaped.

From what is stated above it appears that in the constitution of Rādhā, in Her devotional love, there is some specia-

lity whereby she occupies the highest stage in the hierarchy of the manifestations of divine love. This distinctive attribute is described in Vaisṇava Psychology as Mahābhāva, or, more accurately, Mahābhāva considered in its aspect of Mādana.¹ For the same reason of the paucity of the English language as was already pointed out, it is very difficult to give an accurate explanation of these terms or to render them into English equivalents. All that we can say is that it is that stage of divine love which stands far above the stage a human soul can aspire to reach by way of attaining the summum bonum. Now the highest bonum prescribed by Vaiṣṇava Philosophy for a human soul is what will be described later on as Premānanda or, more accurately, a mere glimmering of Premānanda. This Prema, which is nothing but the essence of the Hlādinī or Rasa Śakti of Bhagavān, when passing through several stages by way of greater and greater development, turns into that beatific love which is called Bhāva, occupying the seventh stage in the out-lined gradation of development proceeding from Prema. This Bhāva, again, when undergoing a further development so as to characterise the minds of none but the Gopīs of Vṛndāvana, becomes Mahābhāva. This Mahābhāva feeling has many aspects of which two are called Mohana and Mādana; and of these again the former is common to Rādhā and some only of her Kāyavyūhas or associates Gopīs, while the latter is present in Rādhā and Rādhā alone. The excellence of this Mādana Mahābhāva lies in the fact that it combines in itself and yet transcends all the charac-

1. The same idea occurs in the Charitamṛta couplet—Mahābhava Swarupa Sri Radha Thakurani | Sarvagunakhani Kṛṣṇakantasiromani || [Adi Lila, ch. IV], and also in the

verse—तयोऽस्तुभयोर्मध्ये राधिका सर्वथाधिका । महाभावस्वरूपेयं गुणैरतिवरीयसी ॥ [Ujjvala Nīlamanī, p. 59].

teristics of the different kinds of ecstatic emotional joy varying from the low stage of Rati to the stage of Mahābhāva in all its aspects. This appears from the text—**सर्वभावोद्गमोत्सासी मदनीयं परात्परः । राजते ह्लादिनीसारो राधायामेव यः सदा ॥**

(Ujjvala Nilamāṇi, Bombay Edition p. 409)

This highest emotional divine love is always present in the heart of Rādhā and sometimes appears in outward manifestation.¹

It is by reason of this Mahābhāva ecstasy of love that Rādhā is described in the Vilat Gāntamīya text as **देवी कृष्णमयी प्रोक्ता राधिका परदेवता । सर्वलक्ष्मीमयी सर्वकान्तिः सम्मोहिनी परा ॥** In other words, Rādhā by means of her height of ecstatic joy shines resplendent with an all-surpassing halo of lustre, and is inseparably connected with the beautiful sports of Kṛṣṇa. This very idea is also the underlying sense of the

1. Although I am quite conscious of the fact that such mere statement of the technical terms like Mahābhāva etc is not at all sufficient to give an idea of their significance in religion, yet I cannot help doing it for several reasons. In the first place, to express in language—specially in a foreign tongue—the full significance of these stages of divine love is rather an absurd task; and if it is at all possible to give only a vague idea thereof, it will require volumes. Secondly, even a mere indication without elucidation of these points is thought to be necessary to let philosophic minds and moralists of the west know that their classification of feelings is a very trifling thing in comparison to what the Hindu psychology of feelings has done. Thirdly, to omit a reference to these stages of ecstatic joy of devotion is indeed doing a great injustice to the exposition of the Principle of Rādhā.

Rg. Vedic text—राधया माधवो देवो माधवेनेव etc. cited previously. The text means that “Mālhava or Kṛṣṇa, the Self-luminous Being of beatific sports, and Rādhā, the highest divinity of the bliss-potencies of Kṛṣṇa,—these two inseparably-connected entities shine resplendent with their own halo of glory amongst beings.” This interpretation seems to be inconsistent with the theory of the highest heaven Goloka as the dwelling place of Bhagavān—quite distinct from the universe of beings. The inconsistency however may be explained away by the fact that though really speaking Bhagavān revels in beatific sports in His own eternal heaven, yet the ultimate source of the creation etc of beings lying in the Bliss-potency of Bhagavān, the soul of each of the beings is a bit of the Infinite Bliss; and this real nature of the soul lying hidden under the influence of the Māyā Śakti is posited by full realisation, and then the soul conceives nothing but the ecstatic sports of Kṛṣṇa—Rādhā everywhere in the entire universe of beings. Hence it is that the text quoted above speaks only of the stage of full religious realisation when nothing appears but the blissful sports of Kṛṣṇa prevailing everywhere.

The principle of Rādhā being thus inseparably connected with the concept of Bhagavān, the cult of Kṛṣṇa to be made accurate should be styled the cult of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. Kṛṣṇa is no doubt conceived as the Highest Being in the Bhāgavata cult. The Absoluteness of Kṛṣṇa, again, lies not in His being an Abstract Idea; He is the Concrete One eternally realising Himself by way of ecstatic sports in the midst of the highest display of his Swarūpa Śaktis. This distinctive character of Kṛṣṇa is more definitely indicated by the compound concept Rādhākṛṣṇa if at all we carefully remember the philosophical

import of the word Rādhā. Moreover, as the derivation (from root राध् to worship, to propitiate) shows, from this compound concept it at once follows that Kṛṣṇa the Absolute is to be realised not in the manner of self=realisation indicated by Śaṅkara and his followers, but in the way of constant devotion and propitiation by the individual soul not merging in the Highest Self. The chosen word Rādhākṛṣṇa therefore indicates tacitly the relation between the Absolute and human personality as well as the concept of the summum bonum to be attained by an individual soul.

Although thus the concept of Rādhā = Kṛṣṇa clearly expresses the whole theory of the Absolute, yet it is a matter for serious consideration why the author of the Bhāg. texts indicates the principle of Rādhā only in a vague way. He has indeed referred to it in the text—"अनया राधिनो नूनं भगवान् हरिरीश्वरः (X, 30, 28) but that seems to be rather in a mystified way. Whatever the object of such hidden reference might be, there is not the least doubt that it is the principle of Rādhā appended to the concept of Kṛṣṇa that brings out the full import of the Advaya Jñāna Tattva which is the main principle involved in the whole volume of Bhāg. texts. Besides, there are lots of other scriptural texts which corroborate this concept of the Bhāgavata. In the first place, there is the Rg Vedic text just now referred to, which is clear as broad day light about the tenability of the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa theory. The same truth is also involved in the texts of the Vṛhat Goutamiya Tantra—सत्त्वं तत्त्वं परत्वं च तत्त्वं त्रयमहं किल । त्रितत्त्वरूपिणी सापि राधिका मम बल्लभा ॥ प्रकृतेः पर एवाहं सापि मच्छुक्तिरूपिणी । सात्त्विकं रूपमास्थाय पूर्णोऽहं ब्रह्म चित्परः ॥ ब्रह्मणा

प्रार्थितः सम्यक् सम्भवामि युगे युगे । तयः साङ्गं त्वया साङ्गं नाशय
 देवताद्रुहाम् ॥ The lines occur in the context of Kṛṣṇa's speech to Valarāma, and the meaning is this—'I combine in myself the three principles, viz (1) the principle of the totality of effects, (2) the principle of causality, and (3) the principle higher than these two. Rādhikā too, my dearest, devotee, is of this nature. I am transcendental to Prakṛti the prime cause, so is she my potency. I am Pūrṇa Brahman inasmuch as Bliss is my form and Knowledge is (preeminent?) in me. Being inclined by the devotion of Hiraṇyagaroha Brahmā I manifest myself to the phenomenal world in every yuga, along with you my partial aspect and her (Rādhā), with the object of suppressing those that tyrannise over gods'.

From the Ādipurāṇa text again (अहमेव परं रूपं न न्यो
 जानति कश्चन । जानति राधिका नूनम् अंशानर्हं न देवताः)
 we know that Rādhikā alone fully realises the whole concept of the Ultimate Reality, while gods and other beings attain only partial realisation. The implication of the text, however, is that the devotional ecstatic love of Rādhā is simply an ideal one which is always to be approached but can never be actually reached by phenomenal beings of the universe.

In the Viṣṇu Purāṇa also there are explicit references to the Principle of Rādhā. We are thus in a position to assert that the concept of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa which is the main theme of the Bhāg. texts is corroborated by various other scriptural texts, and is thus established on a sound and sure basis.

The above exposition of Kṛṣṇa philosophy as indicated by the compound concept of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa is, I am afraid, highly criticised by many modern scholars who hold that this is

not true Kṛṣṇa = philosophy but popular or vulgar Kṛṣṇaism and as such is to be ignored as untenable. Their main objection perhaps is that the name Rādhā does not occur in the Bhāgavata. They cannot convince themselves without a direct emphatic statement on this point like the statement contained in the mahāvākya कृष्णस्तु भगवान् स्वयम्.

✓ To meet this objection, while admitting that nowhere in the Bhāg(texts is to be found a clear mention of the name Rādhā, I must not fail to point out that there are lots of texts in the Bhāgavata (e.g. X, 30, 31) in which the author has explicitly used the word प्रिया, and that this word undoubtedly points to the fact that amongst the Gopīs there is some Divinity that stands unparalleled and unapproachable in the matter of devotional spirits towards Kṛṣṇa. Moreover, the whole tenth chapter of the Bhāgavata is nothing but an elaboration of the highly esoteric doctrine based upon this very principle of Rādhā or Kṛṣṇapriyā, and the great importance of the tenth chapter can never be minimised in view of the author's direct statement "दशमस्य विशुद्ध्यर्थं नवानामिह लक्षणम्" which means that the first nine chapters are but an introduction to the tenth chapter. There can not be the least doubt, therefore, that the sage Vyāsa had the principle of Rādhā clearly in his mind when he revealed the Bhāg. text, however tacitly or implicitly he might have referred to the name Rādhā. To put the same thing by way of an analogy—Nowhere in the whole commentary text on the Ved. Sūtras does Śaṅkara mention the word Māyā, yet from the manner of his treatment no body, unawares of the fact that the word does occur in Śaṅkara's commentary on the Upaniṣads, hesitates to associate with his name the principle of Māyā as

an illusion; similarly, from the manner of treatment the principle of Rādhā is justly associated with the name of Vyāsa notwithstanding the fact that he has never explicitly used the term Rādhā in the whole volume of Bhāg. texts.

Again, although we are quite conscious of the fact that the number of non-bhāgavatic texts cited by V. philosophers as containing the word Rādhā is not large and so the evidence on the point is rather meagre, still we must draw attention to the fact that it is the connotation of the term and not the term itself that plays an important part in the sphere of religion. The dualistic theory of the Vaiṣṇavas cannot be ignored, and the dualism is expressed in the relation between God and soul—the relation between God the worshipped object and the individual soul as the worshipper or devotee. If the Ultimate Reality is to be regarded as the Ideal Being, we cannot but recognise at the same time the existence of an Ideal Devotee. And what the Bhāg. texts describe as Rādhā or Priyā is nothing but this Ideal Devotee. If then this vital point in Vaiṣṇavism be carefully remembered, there will be no reason why an objection should be raised against the principle of Rādhā being inseparably appended to the concept of Advaya Jñāna Tattva Kṛṣṇa. Thus we can conclude by saying that, as against the view of those objectionists, if there is anything like true Kṛṣṇa philosophy it is surely involved in the compound concept of Rādhā-kṛṣṇa, and always to look to the philosophic import of the term Rādhā would remove all doubts and silence all controversy.

Meaning of Līlā

From the foregoing pages it appears that the theory of the Absolute according to Vaiṣṇava Philosophy is that of Kṛṣṇa eternally realising Himself in the midst of ecstatic sports. The word 'Sport' has been used throughout as the

English equivalent for the Samskr̥t word 'Līlā' and we have reasons to do so. As already pointed out, the word 'Līlā' occurs in the Ved. Sūtra II, 1, 33 "लोकवच्च लीलाकैवल्यम्"

where all the commentators agree in taking the word in the sense of 'sport'; and because this is also the meaning given in lexicons, we are fully justified in adopting this meaning. Creation indeed is a veritable puzzle, and to explain this the philosophic thought of the west has attempted several theories varying from crude materialism to idealism. The highest development of the idealistic theory was, it seems to me, reached in the objective idealism of Hegel, which states that eternal creative processes are indispensably necessary for the realisation of the Absolute Idea. Without entering into a thoroughgoing examination of the theory, all that we can say for our present purpose is that it is open to one grave objection, viz, that by regarding creative processes as a necessity for the realisation of the Absolute Idea, it reduces the Absolute into one in which a feeling of uneasiness or want is felt, and thereby the Absolute character of the Absolute Idea is lost altogether, and the idea of imperfection creeps upon the Absolute. To avoid such objections the Vedānta has justly put forward the theory that creation is a mere sport of the Absolute. It is to be noted here that the idea of 'sport' has two main characteristics viz (1) that no exertion is felt, (2) that there is no ulterior motive to satisfy some purpose. We have already shown how the latter characteristic is not made out if Śaṅkara's theory of Brahman be accepted. Even the explanation given by Rāmānuja of the above sūtra has been shown to be open to one objection. The theory of creation as a mere sport, therefore, becomes the most tenable if only the Absolute be regarded as the Highest Substance consisting of endless attributes concentrated in Bliss. In other words, if Kṛṣṇa

an illusion; similarly, from the manner of treatment the principle of Rādhā is justly associated with the name of Vyāsa notwithstanding the fact that he has never explicitly used the term Rādhā in the whole volume of Bhāg. texts.

Again, although we are quite conscious of the fact that the number of non-bhāgavādic texts cited by V. philosophers as containing the word Rādhā is not large and so the evidence on the point is rather meagre, still we must draw attention to the fact that it is the connotation of the term and not the term itself that plays an important part in the sphere of religion. The dualistic theory of the Vaiṣṇavas cannot be ignored, and the dualism is expressed in the relation between God and soul—the relation between God the worshipped object and the individual soul as the worshipper or devotee. If the Ultimate Reality is to be regarded as the Ideal Being, we cannot but recognise at the same time the existence of an Ideal Devotee. And what the Bhāg. texts describe as Rādhā or Priyā is nothing but this Ideal Devotee. If then this vital point in Vaiṣṇavism be carefully remembered, there will be no reason why an objection should be raised against the principle of Rādhā being inseparably appended to the concept of Advaya Jñāna Tattva Kṛṣṇa. Thus we can conclude by saying that, as against the view of those objectionists, if there is anything like true Kṛṣṇa philosophy it is surely involved in the compound concept of Rādhā-kṛṣṇa, and always to look to the philosophic import of the term Rādhā would remove all doubts and silence all controversy.

Meaning of Līlā

From the foregoing pages it appears that the theory of the Absolute according to Vaiṣṇava Philosophy is that of Kṛṣṇa eternally realising Himself in the midst of ecstatic sports. The word 'Sport' has been used throughout as the

English equivalent for the Sanskrit word 'Līlā' and we have reasons to do so. As already pointed out, the word 'Līlā' occurs in the Ved. Sūtra II, 1, 33 "लोकवत्तु लीलैकैवल्यम्"

where all the commentators agree in taking the word in the sense of 'sport'; and because this is also the meaning given in lexicons, we are fully justified in adopting this meaning. Creation indeed is a veritable puzzle, and to explain this the philosophic thought of the west has attempted several theories varying from crude materialism to idealism. The highest development of the idealistic theory was, it seems to me, reached in the objective idealism of Hegel, which states that eternal creative processes are indispensably necessary for the realisation of the Absolute Idea. Without entering into a thoroughgoing examination of the theory, all that we can say for our present purpose is that it is open to one grave objection, viz, that by regarding creative processes as a necessity for the realisation of the Absolute Idea, it reduces the Absolute into one in which a feeling of uneasiness or want is felt, and thereby the Absolute character of the Absolute Idea is lost altogether, and the idea of imperfection creeps upon the Absolute. To avoid such objections the Vedānta has justly put forward the theory that creation is a mere sport of the Absolute. It is to be noted here that the idea of 'sport' has two main characteristics viz (1) that no exertion is felt, (2) that there is no ulterior motive to satisfy some purpose. We have already shown how the latter characteristic is not made out if Śaṅkara's theory of Brahman be accepted. Even the explanation given by Rāmānuja of the above sūtra has been shown to be open to one objection. The theory of creation as a mere sport, therefore, becomes the most tenable if only the Absolute be regarded as the Highest Substance consisting of endless attributes concentrated in Bliss. In other words, if Kṛṣṇa

the Rāsa of the Upaniṣads be regarded as the Ultimate Reality, then and then only creation will be most satisfactorily explained as a mere sport.¹ The question now is 'Is creation a sport or Līlā of Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa as Kṛṣṇa'? We have already said that though Kṛṣṇa as Bhagavān is the ultimate source of creation, sustentation etc of the phenomenal world, yet the direct causality of creation etc is ascribed to Him in His partial aspect Paramātmā Puruṣa. Moreover, the universe as it stands consists of such a great diversity of names and forms, consists of such an endless number and gradation of causalities and forces acting and reacting upon one another, is such a wonderful conglomerate of acts and effects going on in the limitations of time and space,—that it cannot but be created by an Omniscient, Omnipotent, All-pervading Being. In other words, creation testifies to the supreme Lordship of Bhagavān; and though it is really a bit of the Infinite Bliss of Bhagavān and as such should appear in its blissful character, yet by the inconceivable Māyā Śakti the blissful character of the sport of creation lies hidden, making room for an indication of the Lordship of Bhagavān. Thus we find that in creation as a sport the intrinsic nature of Bhagavān is not revealed, and we cannot therefore describe this sport as the sport of Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa as Kṛṣṇa. What, then, is that supreme sport which is eternally displayed by Kṛṣṇa as such? It is nothing but that beatific sport—the necessary outcome of the Infinite Bliss of Kṛṣṇa, in which the best part is played by the divine conjugal-relationship which Rādhā bears to Kṛṣṇa.

-
1. As regards this doctrine of creation being a sport of the Absolute Being Bhagavan we refer also to the dictum of Heraklitus, "Making worlds is Zeus' 'pastime,' and also to what Plato says in his Laws, Book VII, p. 803, viz that "Man is made to be the play thing of God."

This unparalleled, all-absorbing, all=astounding Līlā of Rādhākṛṣṇa is described in Vaiṣṇava Philosophy as of two aspects—Prakāṣa or manifest, and Aprakāṣa or non-manifest.¹ Both these Līlās are eternal, and the fact of eternity is based upon various texts. For example, the Vṛh. Up. text “यद् गतं भवच्च भविष्यच्च” says that whatever attributes and acts there are in the Absolute Being are to be understood as having existed in the past, as existing in the present, and as those that exist alike in the future. Again, from the Pippalāda Śākhā text एको देवो नित्यलीलानुरक्तो भक्त्यापी भक्तहृद्यन्तरात्मा it is quite clear that the sports are eternal. The relation between these two Līlās may be briefly stated thus:—One and the same Līlā is indeed going on eternally in the highest heaven Goloka; phenomenal beings like ourselves whose true personality lies hidden and suppressed under the influence of the Māya Śakti have no access to this Līlā; we are not indeed, in this miserable and pitiable state of ours, expected to realise this even in the billionth part; at this stage and with respect to ourselves the Līlā is called non-manifest. But the Love God of the Vaiṣṇavas whose sweet nature it is to sell Himself to and to be conquered completely by the insatiable hankering in the devotion of His dear devotees, who feels not the least hesitation to do any thing and everything, even to go to the most horrible hell for the sake of His dearest devotees, to whom nothing appeals but the incessant flow of propitiation of their dearest Kṛṣṇa—this Love God of the Vaiṣṇavas out of sheer goodness and grace sometimes manifests Himself, in the midst of the blissful ecstatic sports, to phenomenal beings, and at this stage the self=same Līlā of Goloka is called manifest—manifest indeed in the super-sensuous heaventrio of Vṛndāvana, Mathurā and Dwārakā’.

1. See Appendix.

What Vaiṣṇava Philosophy calls Goloka the highest heaven and dwelling place of Kṛṣṇa is indeed one and the same, and it is this that gets the appellation of the heaven-trio from the point of view of the manifest Līlā. The eternity of the Līlā means that its flow is incessantly going on subject to no limitations of time and space; and in the manifest aspect of the Līlā, if, in the midst of the selfsame characteristic of transcendancy over time and space limitations, there is the appearance of the acts of Kṛṣṇa's taking birth and the like,—there is the display of the limited acts like beginning, mediating and termination, all this is surely to be regarded as owing to the inconceivable willforce of the Lord Kṛṣṇa.

The non-manifest Līlā again is described as having two aspects,¹ viz—(1) Mantropāsanāmayī (मन्त्रोपासनामयी) or what is represented in the set formulæ of lip-prayers the daily practice of which with all regularity constitutes the preliminary stage of all religious life, (2) Svārasikī (स्वारसिकी) or what is revealed as a flow in realisation. As we have already said, the real significance of the personal relationship to Bhagavān brought about in the devotional cult lies in the fact that it has a much greater insistent demand upon the time and attention of a person than what the lip-prayers of God require. The more time and attention a person gives for meditating upon Bhagavān, the greater prospect has he of realisation so as to approach nearer and nearer the attainment of the final end. For the human soul as it stands, it is not at all possible in the preliminary stage to meditate upon a good number of the endless beatific sports of Kṛṣṇa—far be it said of a hope for full realisation. Hence it is that in the preliminary stage when by the good grace of Bhagavān manifesting Himself in the shape of a spiritual guide a person is just initiated in-

1. See Appendix.

to the devotional cult, the Līlā of Bhagavān is very tersely indicated to him, as if the Infinite Līlā is restricted to a particular sport or act or rather to unconnected spheres of the beatific sports. And the devotee henceforward is required to practise regularly the meditation upon the Līlā as thus represented in the set formulæ of incantations. Besides, how can it be expected to express adequately in words a thing which is only to be revealed into the heart of mankind? Even Śabda Brahman or the Logos cannot describe in detail the endless ecstatic sports of Kṛṣṇa. Such being the case, the Līlā is to be considered at this preliminary stage in its aspect of Mantropāsanaṁyāi.

Then by constant meditation and deep contemplation practised in strict accordance to the rules of the Bhakti cult, the Līlā might ultimately be revealed in its various manifestations linked together, and thereby the devotee feels such an inexplicable divine joy that it has no parallel in the mundane sphere of existence. At this stage of mature realisation, the Līlā is considered in the aspect of स्वारसिकी. Owing to the presence of an uninterrupted flow of devotion the स्वारसिकी Līlā might be compared to the flowing stream of the Ganges, while the other one to a lake of water or strictly speaking to a series of lakes.

From the above it appears that a reconciliation is however possible between the two Līlās. This reconciliation might be indicated by way of reference to the Bhāgavata text—
भवतीनां वियोगो मे न हि सर्वत्र न कश्चित् (X, 47, 29). Kṛṣṇa speaks to the Gopīs “Your separation from me never takes place completely; in other words, you are never separated from my whole self.” What the text really means is this—At

the termination of the Prakāṣa Līlā it appears as if a separation is effected between Kṛṣṇa and the Gopīs, but that is not so; for, though Kṛṣṇa seems to be separated from them so far as the manifest aspect of the Līlā is concerned, yet He is ever in the company of His associates so far as the non-manifest aspect is concerned. In other words, the conjunction between Kṛṣṇa and His divine associates for the purpose of beatific sports is indeed eternal; this is sometimes displayed to phenomenal beings, sometimes taken away from their view. Even in the course of the manifest Līlā, it so happens that Kṛṣṇa by His movement here and there is separated from some of His associates—say, from mother Yaśodā when Kṛṣṇa goes out to look after the cattle, but at that very moment He is in the company of those very associates. This seems rather curious and anomalous to us, phenomenal beings as we are. But we should ever remember the fact that such contradictions, as ‘separation and conjunction’, ‘going out and staying within’, are all conquered in the Absolute by means of His inconceivable supreme Lordship or Omnipotence. Instances of manifestation of such supreme Lordship by way of contradictions conquered are not rare in the Bhāgavata texts. The Līlā of Dāma-bandha, the Līlā of Brahma-mohana, the Līlā of meeting simultaneously a few thousands of Gopīs with one and the same supreme body, and various other Līlās testify to this supreme Lordship of Kṛṣṇa. From all this it is clearly proved therefore that what appears to be a termination of the Līlā is really nothing but an uninterrupted continuous flow of the same—the only difference being in respect of aspect, manifest or non-manifest. In other words, a reconciliation is thus nicely brought about by Vaiṣṇava Philosophers between the two Līlās, Prakāṣa and Aprakāṣa.

Chapter IV.

JĪVA OR INDIVIDUAL SOUL.¹

In western philosophy there is a great ambiguity about the word 'Soul'. It is used in so many different senses—sometimes as a synonym for 'mind', sometimes for 'life', sometimes in the sense of the rational principle in an individual being—that it is very difficult to assert what it exactly means. Although thus there is some difference in meaning, the word soul is generally used as the corresponding word for the Hindu philosophical term 'Jīva' or 'Ātmā'. And following the footsteps of others and for want of a more suitable and appropriate term we have chosen to use this word soul in the sense of 'Jīva'.

Now what is the meaning of 'Jīva'?

To understand the real significance of the word 'Jīva', we are to remember the fact, already stated, that the concept of Bhagavān, as already stated, implies endless attributes inhering in a substance. These attributes are broadly classified into three, viz, (1) Antaraṅgā or Swarūpa Śaktis, (2) Taṭasthā or Jīva Śakti, and (3) Vahiraṅgā or Māyā Śakti. Of these, we have already dealt with the Antaraṅgā Śakti in sufficient detail; and the meaning of the other two, though roughly indicated before, needs likewise a detailed examination. Why is Jīva called the 'Taṭasthā Śakti'? The word Taṭasthā in Sanskrit means 'that which lies on the bank—say, of a river'; and if we are to describe such a thing, we should say that it is neither included in the river proper i.e. water, nor does it come under the category of the village or town or province situated adjoining to the river—near the bank. Similarly, of the endless Jīvas the eternally released ones are eternally beyond the influence of the Māyā Śakti, and the

1. See Appendix

others, i.e., those in bondage may, by taking recourse to the Bhakti Cult, surpass the Māyā Śakti. Hence the Jīva Śakti, does not come under the category of the Māyā Śakti. Nor does it come under the category of the Antarāṅgā Śaktis; and the reason is this:—Owing to its transgression of deviating away from the contiguity of Bhagavān, the Jīva is suppressed by the influence of the Māyā Śakti, but such affectation by Māyā does not accrue even to Paramātmā the partial aspect of Bhagavān—far be it said of Bhagavān Himself who is ever in the display of His Śvarūpa Śaktis;—in other words, owing to the affectation by Māyā, the Jīva Śakti does not come under the category of the Antarāṅgā Śakti of Bhagavān. Moreover, according to the technical meaning of the word तदस्थ,

“तदभिन्नत्वे सति तद्वोधकत्वम्” (“the being indicative of that

in the midst of being different from that’), the Jīva is called Tatāsthā also because, though it is distinct from the Śvarūpa Śakti of Bhagavān, it goes to indicate Bhagavān as its ultimate source, just in the same way as solar rays though distinct from the sun proper indicate nothing but the sun as their source.

The Jīva Śakti, therefore, is a Śakti distinct from the Antarāṅgā as well as from the Vahiraṅgā Śakti. Hence it is that the Jīva is described as the Aparā Śakti in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa text—विष्णुशक्तिः परा प्रोक्ता क्षेत्रज्ञाख्या तथापरा । अविद्या कर्मसंज्ञान्या तृतीया शक्तिरिष्यते ॥ (VI, 7, 61), as well as in the Gītā text—अपरेयमितस्त्वन्यां प्रकृतिं विद्धि मे पराम् जीवभूतां महाबाहो ययेदं धार्यते जगत् ॥ (VII, 5). And this very idea we also find expressed in the Śruti texts (i) अस्मान्मायी सृजते विश्वमेतत्तस्मिंश्चान्यो मायया संनिरुद्धः । (Śvetā. IV, 9). (ii) तयोरन्यः पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्त्यनश्नन्नन्योऽभिचाकशीति

(Mund. III, 1, 1 also Śvetā IV, 6). (iii) स यदाक्षया त्वजामनु-
शयीत (quoted in the Śaṭ-Sandarbhā, p. 236).

As to the intrinsic nature of a Jīva we may refer in the first place to the words of one Jāmātr Muni who is regarded as the most ancient expounder—antecedent even to Rāmānuja—of the system of philosophy that has given birth to the Śrī-sect of Vaiṣṇavas. Thus we come to know therefrom that negatively speaking a Jīva is neither a deity, nor a man, nor an irrational animal, nor an immovable being like plants; it is neither the body, nor the senses, nor the mind, nor life, nor intellect, nor the understanding; it is neither an unintelligent unconscious substance, nor one liable to transformation, nor consisting of knowledge alone. Affirmatively a Jīva is स्वस्मै-
स्वयं प्रकाशः, एकरूपः, स्वरूपमाप्, चेतनः, व्याप्तिशीलः, चिदा-
नन्दात्मकः, अहमर्थः, प्रतिक्षेत्रं भिन्नः, अणुः, नित्यनिर्मलः, ज्ञातृत्व-
कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वनिजधर्मकः, परमात्मैकशेषत्वस्वभाव ।

What we come to know from the above lines is this—

In the first place, Jīva is not liable to any change. It remains the same retaining its own identity in whatever being it may lie, be it in a deity, in a man or in any other being. Just as life in the sense of 'performance of their respective functions by the several parts of an organic system' is one and the same in whatever individual being it might be, so is Jīva. To explain further:—Change or transformation is principally of the following kinds, viz taking birth or production, retaining existence, development, reduction to another form, decaying and disappearance. None of these is predicated of a Jīva. A Jīva thus is that entity for whose presence brought about by Māyā in an organic body the several parts of the organism, e. g., the mind, the senses etc. are in a position to perform their respective functions. By calling it an entity

or substance we deny the materialistic view that 'Jīva is the mere aggregate of conscious states', and assert that it is a single permanent principle or agent having the power of manifesting itself to itself in a connected system of states and activities in time and at the same time distinguishing itself from them, and asserting itself as one and the same identical principle through all successive states and connecting them all together into unity of a single mental life.

These two inseparable characteristics, viz, (a) non-liability to change and (b) identity in the midst of differences, evidently constitute the eternity of the Jīva; and as to this maxim all the theistic systems of Indian Philosophy agree.¹

Secondly, consciousness being its attribute, Jīva is स्वस्मे स्वयंप्रकाशः. In other words, it is self-luminous. But this self-luminosity is to be understood not in its relation to Bhagavān for the simple reason that Jīva being but a potency of Bhagavān surely gets its illumining force from Bhagavān—the Highest Substance and Source of all. It is self-luminous in relation to an unintelligent substance (जडवस्तु). The latter by itself can neither manifest itself nor manifest others, while a Jīva can do so. It reveals itself to

-
1. cf इत्थं च संसारस्यानादितया आत्मनोऽप्यनादित्वसिद्धावनादिभावस्य नाशासम्भवात् नित्यत्वं सिद्ध्यतीति बोध्यम् Siddhanta Muktaavali, Bibliotheca Indica, Vol IX, p 38, ("and thus by the unbeginningness of transmigration the eternity of soul being proved and since an unbeginning entity cannot be destroyed, the eternity of soul is demonstrated. So it is to be understood"); also—जीव ईशो विशुद्धा चित् विभागश्च तयोर्द्वयोः । अविद्या तच्चिन्मयो योगः पञ्चस्माकमनादयः ॥, quoted in the Siddhantaratnamala ("The soul, Isā, pure chit i. e. Brahman, the distinction of the first two, Nescience, and its connexion with Chit—these our six are held to be without beginning")

itself as appears from the process of conscious reflection; and by its presence it manifests unintelligent substances. Besides consciousness, it has also the attribute of bliss. This is shown in two ways—(i) since it receives its existence from Bhagavān, it cannot but be blissful in its intrinsic nature, for bliss is the pre-eminent attribute of Bhagavān; (ii) our experience tells us that an individual being is always averse to pain and ever seeks after pleasure. If, therefore, pleasure is its attribute even in the state of suppression by Māyā, there is no doubt that pleasure is its attribute in the stage before the affectation by Māyā, though of course there is an absolute difference between the two pleasures. Owing to its conscious nature, Jīva is called Chetana which in Saṃskṛt means 'that which manifests others'.

Thirdly, Jīva is called **अत्यन्तशैलः** or having the power of pervading. The significance of this characteristic is well understood in its relation to the other attribute, viz, that Jīva is **अणु** or very minute. An Anu or atom is defined as an indivisible substance, the culminating point of smallness. Its smallness is beyond perception and so can not be adequately expressed in words. Yet some how to give an idea we may say that if the hundredth part of the end of a piece of hair be divided into hundred parts, that would roughly amount to an atom. This very idea about the smallness of Jīva we find expressed in the Śruti texts—**एषोऽणु रात्मा धेतसा वेदितव्यो यस्मिन् प्राणः पञ्चधा संविवेश** (Mund. III, 9), **गलाग्रशतभागस्य शतधा कल्पितस्य च भागो जीवः स विज्ञेयः** (I, 16, 11), **एष नित्योऽययः सूक्ष्मः** etc (VI, 16, 18), **केभ्राग्रशतस्य शतांशसदृशतमकः । जीवः सूक्ष्मस्वरूपोऽयं संख्यातीतो हि तूकः ॥** (X, 87, 26), we know that Jīva is the smallest conceivable. Though thus of an atomic size Jīva is

capable of pervading the whole organic system of a body so as to enable each and every part of the system to perform its own function¹. Such pervasiveness is of course owing to the inexplicable magnetic influence of Jīva, just in the same way as a very small quantity of some medicinal herb borne somewhere in the body invigorates simultaneously the whole bodily system. In this connection it is necessary to refer to the Gītā text

नित्यः सर्वगतः स्थाणु रचलोऽयं सनातनः (II, 24) which speaks of the all-pervasiveness of Jīva. This seems to be conflicting with the various scriptural texts, and a reconciliation is possible only if we interpret the Gītā text by saying that when at the great dissolution the endless Jīvas by way of reabsorption lie in a subtle state with Bhagavān then the Jīva in that state would be called **सर्वगत** or all-pervading, for otherwise Bhagavān Himself would not be called so.

Fourthly, in its intrinsic nature of being a bit of the Infinite Bliss and Knowledge of Bhagavān, Jīva is truly called Aham or Ego. This real significance of Aham is to be carefully distinguished from what wrongly goes by the same name under the influence of the Māyā Śakti. In the latter case the material substance Prakṛti is wrongly identified with the true Ego and what is really the act of Prakṛti is erroneously ascribed to Jīva. Owing to its real function—the thought and meditation about the Highest Substance—being taken away,

1. This pervasiveness of a Jīva is referred to in the Ved. Sūtra **गुणादवलोकवत्** II,3,26 which means that 'just as a lamp by means of its virtue of luminosity lights a whole house, so also a Jīva though intrinsically of atomic size, by reason of its attributes—undecayingness and the like—is capable of pervading simultaneously the whole organic system of a body.'

Jīva becomes engrossed in thought of Prakṛti, and thereby the real 'aham' is thrown into the background yielding place to a new ego. This new ego corresponds to the empirical ego in the western system. That Jīva is quite distinct from this empirical ego may be shown thus—In dreamless sleep all functional activities of the senses and of the mind cease; even the understanding remains inactive, for the whole function of the understanding consists in its synthetic activity of subjection whereby the sense-manifold being thrown into the mould-like universal principles of time and space are brought into relation to the ego, and in dreamless sleep no such condition is present. In other words, in dreamless sleep no consciousness can reasonably be ascribed to the new ego. After such a dreamless sleep when we wake, we say "I slept a sound sleep", and owing to this remembrance it must be said that even in dreamless sleep there is present the real ego in its self-conscious state, for it is a psychological fact that remembrance and consciousness inhere in the same substance or entity. Thus we see that Jīva is an Ego which should not be confused with the empirical ego or what Hindu Philosophy calls Prākṛta Ahamkāra.

Fifthly, Jīva is not one but many. Being of the atomic dimension it can not simultaneously exist in different individual beings. A very small piece of a medicinal herb borne by an individual, though it might invigorate the whole organic system of that particular being, can not simultaneously migrate to other beings; so is the case with Jīva. The theory of plurality of Jīvas must therefore be upheld. Had it not been so, one and the same Jīva would have simultaneously pervaded, like Paramātmā, the whole universe of beings, and in that case there would be no place, in the system of Viśiṣṭa Philosophy, for Paramātmā as the Immanent Regulator of all beings.

This doctrine of plurality of Jīvas is also directly stated in the Ved. Sūtra II, 3, 48, where the commentator Rāmānuja says—"Although the souls, as being parts of Brahman and so on, are of essentially the same character, they are actually separate, for each of them is of atomic size and resides in a separate body. For this reason there is no confusion or mixing up of the individual spheres of enjoyment and experience" (Thibaut's Translation of Rāmānuja, p. 565).

Though Jīvas are many, yet they are related in difference as well as non-difference. In so far as each is undecaying by itself there is the sameness in all Jīvas; still there is difference, and this difference appears in two-fold ways, viz—(1) while encased in corporeal frames different Jīvas suffer weal and woe differently according to the difference, in nature, of the acts done in this or previous existence; (2) while bereft of gross bodies different Jīvas occupy different positions in the hierarchy of spiritual life according to the difference in the nature of the devotional practices.

Sixthly, Jīva is pure, and the purity consists in the fact that in its intrinsic nature it is not affected in any way by the impure effects of Māyā. When encased in a corporeal frame it remains all the while as a passive looker on of the impure effects going on, which effects are really attributed to the empirical ego that is thus brought about by the Māyā Śakti by way of overshadowing the real ego or pure Jīva.

Lastly, the eternity of the Jīva, already referred to, necessarily follows from its being an attribute of the Eternal Absolute. As such, the knowledge and bliss though finite in comparison with the Infinite knowledge and bliss of Bhagavān, eternally inheres in the Jīva. Such knowledge and bliss is indeed explicit in the Jīvas that are eternally released. In those, on the other hand, which on account

of the beginningless deviation away from the contiguity of Bhagavān come under the influence of the Māyā Śakti, there is a mere faint glimmering of this innate knowledge (called स्वरूपानुबन्धित्व in Vaiṣṇava Philosophy); and this fact cannot but be admitted for otherwise no satisfactory explanation can be given for the intuitive belief in the Absolute Being which the philosophic thought of Vaiṣṇavism accepts as the starting point in religious practice.

The characteristics of a Jiva, thus far indicated and explained, may also be strengthened by various scriptural texts.

Thus the Kaṭh. Up. 11, 18, text—न जायते म्रियते वा विपश्चि-
न्नायं कुतश्चिन्न वभूव कश्चित् । अजो नित्यः शाश्वतोऽयं पुराणो न
हन्यते हन्यमाने शरीरे ॥ evidently speaks of the eternity and

non-liability-to-change of a Jiva. The Bhāg. texts again—

आत्मा नित्योऽव्ययः शुद्ध एकः क्षेत्रज्ञ आश्रयः । अविक्रियः सदृग्-
धेतुर्व्यापकोऽसंयतनावृतः ॥ एतैर्द्वादशभिर्विद्वानात्मनो लक्षणैः परैः ।

अहंममेत्यसद्भावं देहादौ मोहजं त्यजेत् ॥ (VII, 7, 19-20) dis-
tinctly state all the characteristics indicated above. The

same view is also held in the Āyurvedic Suśruta Saṃhitā

text—“त एते अनुमानग्राह्याः परमसूक्ष्माश्चेतनावन्तः शाश्वताः...

.....आयुर्वेदशास्त्रेषु असर्वगताः क्षेत्रज्ञाः नित्याश्च तिर्यग्गो-

नमानुषदेवेषु सञ्चरन्ति धर्माधर्मान्मेतन्म् (Śārirasthāna, ch.

I, 16-17) with the reservation that what is called empirical
ego goes here by the name of Karmapurusa.

Classification of Jivas¹:—The endless Jivas thus descri-
bed as having twelve main characteristics are classified in the

1. See Appendix.

Vaiṣṇava System into two principal classes, viz—(1) Those that are eternally inclined towards Bhagavān; in them their intrinsic nature of being chitkṣaṇa and Ānanda-kṣaṇa is eternally explicit, and hence by the benign influence of the highest display of the Swarūpaśaktis they are acknowledged as eternal associates in the beatific sports of Bhagavān, (2) those that are averse to Bhagavan from beginningless time, in them the innate characteristic of knowledge and bliss or simply chit (as Vaiṣṇava Philosophy very often uses this term chit in the sense of the three Antarāṅgā Śaktis combined together) is implicit and by the Vahirāṅgā Śakti of Bhagavān they are compelled to undergo the trial—so to say—of being born again and again, subject of course to limiting adjuncts, and such births continue till the attainment of Self realisation.

CHAPTER V.

THE DOCTRINE OF MĀYĀ.¹

As indicated in the previous chapters, the Vahirāṅgā Śakti of Bhagavān is also called the Māyā Śakti. The Swarūpa Lakṣaṇa of Māyā we get from the Bhāg. text—

ऋतेऽर्थे यत् प्रतीयेत न प्रतीयेत चात्मनि ।

तद् विद्यादात्मनो मायां यथाभासो यथा तमः ॥

(II, 9, 33) "That potency of Bhagavān, which is conceived outside His intrinsic self-hood and yet which is not conceived irrespectively of Him is called Māyā." The Śruti says—

भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिशिङ्ख्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः । क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि
तस्मिन् दृष्टे परावरे ॥ (Mund. II, 2, 8), i.e., all ties of the

1. See Appendix.

heart are broken, all doubts are removed and all acts cease, if that Parāvara or the Highest Being is seen. These ties etc., again, as will be shown below, are nothing but the creation of Māyā, and their suppression consequently means absence of the conception of Māyā. Thus we see, if there is realisation of the Absolute Being, there is no conception of Māyā. Moreover, Māyā being but a potency, its conception necessarily involves the idea of a potent Being or Substance as the receptacle of that potency, and that potent Being is Bhagavān. A potency can never stand by itself, it always inheres in a substance. So we are led to conclude that the Swarūpa Lakṣaṇa of Māyā is justly stated in the above verse. The Taṭastha Lakṣaṇa of Māyā, again, appears from the text एषा माया भगवतः सृष्टिस्थित्यन्तकारिणी । त्रिवर्णा वर्णितास्माभिः किं भूयः श्रोतुमिच्छसि ॥ (Bhāg. XI, 3, 16), which says that Māyā is that potency of Bhagavān which by reason of the three guṇas causes the creation, sustentation and dissolution of the phenomenal world.

This Māyā Śakti to which the causality of the world is thus ascribed has two main aspects, viz. (1) Nimitta Māyā, (2) Upādāna Māyā, such classification of causality corresponding to what the Aristotelian system lays down as Efficient and Material cause. The generic concept of Māyā as consisting of these two individual concepts is clearly expressed and elaborated in the text—कालो दैवं कर्म जीवः स्वभावो द्रव्यं क्षेत्रं प्राणमात्मा विकारः । तत्सङ्घातो वीजरोहप्रवाहस्तन्मायैषा तन्निषेधं प्रपद्ये ॥ (X, 63. 26). Here the four concepts of काल, दैव, कर्म and स्वभाव constitute the elements of the Nimitta aspect or Efficient causality, while the others make up the

Material cause or Prakṛti or Pradhāna. Let us explain each of the terms. By Kāla or time is meant that Vṛtti or function of Paramātmā, which consists in disturbing the equilibrium state of the three guṇas in the Pradhāna so as to bring about a change in the shape of production of effects. (cf. कालवृत्त्या तु मायायां गुणमय्यामधोक्षजः । पुरुषेणात्मभूतेन वीर्य्यमाधत्त वीर्य्यवान् ॥ (III, 5, 26) This Vedāntic idea of time is similar to the western conception whereby time, like space, is to be understood as a universal principle that underlies the idea of change. The conception thus overthrows the Naiyāyikas view of Kāla as a substance, and is also an improvement upon the Sāṅkhists' view which attributes the disturbance of the equilibrium state of the Pradhāna to the contiguity alone of Puruṣa and Prakṛti. By 'Karma' is meant the acts done by beings, or strictly speaking, by the empirical egos in mundane existences from time immemorial. Such acts are of course other than those that follow necessarily from the intrinsic nature of a Jīva, and as such are excluded from the category of devotional worship and the like. The steady proneness of these acts towards the production of effects is what is styled here 'Daiva', and the impressions left by the acts constitute what is called here 'Svabhāva'. The combination of these concepts thus constitutes the efficient aspect of Māyā which is regarded as the generic force of causality in the matter of creation.

By 'Dravya' is here meant the subtle state of the five elements; Prāṇa is the vital principle otherwise called Vāyu, which in Hindu Physiology is described as "the subtle principle that regulates all the processes of nerve-irritation and the impulse of the neurons within the sympathetic nervous system of a body, as well as the underlying principle of all the processes of stimuli being carried to the different senses."

'Ātmā' here means the Aham principle or the emperical ego underlying the process of subjectivation operated upon the sense=manifold; 'Vikāra' means the eleven senses including Manas, as well as the five gross elements, and 'Deha' or body is the conglomerate in a cosmic order of these sixteen evolutes.

The Nimitta Māyā, also called Jīva-Māyā, has twofold functions viz Vidyā and Avidyā, as we come to know from the text,—विद्याविद्ये मम तनू विद्ध्युद्धव शरीरिणाम् । वन्धमोक्षकरी आद्ये मायया मे विनिर्मिते ॥ (Bhāg. XI, 11, 3) Vidyā means Right knowledge which consists in the ascertainment of the true nature of a Jīva as a bit of the infinite supersensuous Knowledge and Bliss of Bhagavān; Avidyā, generally rendered into Nescience, means Ignorance about this true character of a Jīva. These two are beginningless emanations of the Māyā Śakti. Vidyā being a vṛtti or function of the Swarūpa Śakti of Bhagavān is indeed eternal; that is to say, a Jīva is eternally self-conscious of its true nature, but this self-consciousness is sometimes explicit (e. g. in the case of eternally released souls), and sometimes implicit (as in the case of those that are affected by Māyā). Of these two emanations of Māyā, Avidyā has two functions, viz,—Āvaraṇātmikā and Viksepātmikā. The former consists in the concealment of the true nature of a Jīva, while the latter operates by way of overpowering the Jīva by means of a conflicting consciousness which, as will be shown below, consists in the production of a new ego or the emperical ego. The true function of the Jīva being thus thrown into the background, all consciousness and all pleasure of the emperical ego are confined to the body, the sense organs, the internal organ and the like. This operation of the Avidyā thus effects the bondage of the soul—the bondage which, strictly speaking, affects the em-

perical ego. It is clear, therefore, that Avidyā is indeed an emanation of Māyā. But the question is, how can Vidyā be regarded as an effect of Māyā? As stated above, Vidyā which is a Vṛtti of the Swarūpa Śakti of Bhagavān can not possibly be regarded as an effect of Māyā, for the simple reason that Bhagavān in His Swarūpa Śakti is not at all concerned with Māyā—the Śakti displayed only by Paramātmā the partial aspect of Bhagavān. To avoid this difficulty the word Vidyā in the verse must be taken in the sense of 'a doorway to Right knowledge being explicit.' That this doorway to Vidyā is indeed the effect of Māyā can be thus explained.—By the operation of the Avidyā function as well as of the Pradhāna aspect of the Māyā Śakti, the manifold sensuous objects thus created by way of evolution form the only object of perception of the ego. The constitutive nature of finitude and transience again of these sensuous objects is such that when too much addicted to they naturally create an aversion on the part of the ego, and this averseness which is described in the Vedānta System as **इहामूत्र फलभोगविरागः** forms a doorway to Right knowledge. And because such averseness follows from the very nature of the products of Māyā, it is but meet that Vidyā as a doorway to Vidyā is an effect of the Māyā Śakti. This theory must at any rate be upheld if we want to understand at all the real significance of the injunctions laid down in the beginning of the Śruti texts. If the main function of the Śrūtis is to give us knowledge about the definite character of the Absolute, why is it that they lay down injunctions about the performance of a son-begetting sacrifice, an agnistoma rite, or the like? As already stated, the motive underlying all these injunctions is to create an averseness to the manifold objects of this world or that. And thereby preparing a doorway to the knowledge of the Highest Self, the Śrūtis gradually teach us that

knowledge by way of stating—नेति नेति, अस्थूलोऽनयुः, and सत्यं ज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म etc.

The Upādāna aspect of the Māyā is thus described in the texts—यत्तन्निगुणमव्यक्तं नित्यं सदसदात्मकम् । प्रधानं प्रकृतिं प्रादुरविशेषं विशेषवित् ॥ (III. 26, 10), सा वा एतस्य संद्रष्टुः शक्तिः सदसदात्मिका.....(III, 5, 25), from which it appears that the Upādānā Māyā is called Pradhāna or Prakṛti or Guṇa Māyā. It is the equipoised condition of the three guṇas Sattwa, Rajas and Tamas, and as such it is called Avyakta or Non-manifest or Avyākṛta, in as-much as in this stage the differences of evolvents and evolutes—such as Mahat, Ahaṁkāra, senses, elements etc are not yet manifest. We might compare it by way of analogy to the idea of Platonic Matter as thus propounded in his *Timæus*—“This mother and receptacle of all visible and sensible things we do not call earth, nor air, nor fire, nor water, nor anything produced from them or from which these are produced. It is an invisible, formless thing, the recipient of everything participating in a certain way of the intelligible but in a way very difficult to seize.” It is called Pradhāna in the sense that, though it is the source of all the evolutes like Mahat and others, yet it transcends them and so is superior to them. It is called Prakṛti in-as-much as it is सदसदात्मिका which means that Prakṛti is the underlying principle of all the things Mahat and others. Some of these things are Sat (सत्) or manifest as evolutes, some are Asat or non-manifest as evolvents that are nothing but the effects in their subtle or non-manifest state, some again have the twofold characteristics of cause and effect. Though thus the underlying principle of Mahat and others, the concept of Prakṛti is not to be confused with that of Brahman since the latter transcends the three guṇas—the constituent elements

of Prakṛti. The concept of Pradhāna thus indicated is to be traced to the Upaniṣad texts, e. g. the Śvetā Text—प्रधान क्षेत्र-
ज्ञपतिर्गुणेशः संसारबन्धस्थितिमोक्षहेतुः (VI, 16)

The operation of the Māyā thus described in detail has been explained in the chapter on the concept of Bhagavān by way of analogy to the operation involved in solar phenomena, and this fact is also tacitly referred to in the verse quoted above giving the svarūpā lakṣaṇa of Māyā. From the phenomena of the sun's light it appears that very near to the solar disc and yet outside it there is a halo of light which consists of all the seven colours blending together so as not to be distinguished. Just as this halo of light appears outside the disc, and yet is such that it could not have existed as such had there been no disc, so is the case with Māyā. Further, it may be pointed out that owing to its excessive brightness the light of the halo dazzles the eye which thereby has its own power of sight suspended for the time being—it can be seen only by means of a scientific instrument; and the seven colours that lie in a blending state within the halo can sometimes be distinguished, e. g. by means of a scientific apparatus. The several effects of the Māyā, viz,—that the true nature of a Jīva is concealed, that Prakṛti is the equipoised condition of the guṇas, that the state of equilibrium being disturbed gives rise to manifold sensuous objects—these effects of the Māyā correspond to the several phenomena, viz, the eye being dazzled, the halo consisting of the seven colours in a blending state, and these very colours distinguished sometimes by an instrument.

The above lines, I am afraid, are sufficient to indicate the view of Vaiṣṇava Philosophy about the Principle of Māyā. But in view of the great importance of this principle in

Indian Philosophy, I think it would be an omission if it is not examined a little further from the critical point of view. Indeed the theory of *Māyā* is so deep-rooted in the Indian mind, that almost every Indian young or old, male or female, be he a Hindu, an Islam or of any other caste or creed, is often and anon heard to say "all this we see is a mere illusion—it is nothing but *Maya*, the world is false, and so on". Outside India also we find philosophers that take care to know anything of Indian Philosophy interpret *Māyā* in the sense of Illusion or Dream of Dream as Mr. Cowell puts it. All these statements regarding the meaning of '*Maya*' they connect unhesitatingly with the name of the great commentator Śaṅkara. Śaṅkara's theory of the Vedānta, it might be added here, is generally interpreted by critical minds of the East and West to involve, besides the points of oneness between Brahman and individual soul, the two other points of Falsity of the world and *Māyā* as an Illusion. In the Theologic-Philosophical treatise like *Charitāmṛta* also there is a clear reference to this meaning of *Māyā* as an Illusion being associated with the name of Śaṅkara.

This Śaṅkara's theory of *Māyā* as an Illusion—strange it is that the word *Māyā* nowhere occurs throughout his commentary on the Sūtras—can be traced to his commentary on the Upaniṣads, and has been developed in the Sūtra—commentary. Although this theory, for reasons undefinable like the undefinable *Māyā*, has gained ground for more than a decade of centuries and has spread its influence far abroad in the west (be it said to the credit and discredit of the late lamented saint Vivekānanda), yet we do not hesitate to assert that it serves as a stumbling block to his theory of the Vedānta. With whatever subtleties he might have attempted to give a consistent exposition of this theory of *Avidyā* so

of Prakṛti. The concept of Pralīna thus indicated is to be traced to the Upanisad texts, e. g. the Śvetā Text—प्रधान क्षेत्रज्ञपतिर्गुणेशः संसारबन्धस्थितिमोक्षहेतुः (VI, 16)

The operation of the Māyā thus described in detail has been explained in the chapter on the concept of Bhagavān by way of analogy to the operation involved in solar phenomena, and this fact is also tacitly referred to in the verse quoted above giving the svarūpā lakṣṇa of Māyā. From the phenomena of the sun's light it appears that very near to the solar disc and yet outside it there is a halo of light which consists of all the seven colours blending together so as not to be distinguished. Just as this halo of light appears outside the disc, and yet is such that it could not have existed as such had there been no disc, so is the case with Māyā. Further, it may be pointed out that owing to its excessive brightness the light of the halo dazzles the eye which thereby has its own power of sight suspended for the time being—it can be seen only by means of a special instrument; and the seven colours that lie in a blending state within the halo can sometimes be distinguished, e. g. by means of a scientific apparatus. The several effects of the Māyā, viz.—that the true nature of a Jiva is concealed, that Prakṛti is the equipoised condition of the guṇas, that the state of equilibrium being disturbed gives rise to manifold sensuous objects—these effects of the Māyā correspond to the several phenomena, viz, the eye being dazzled, the halo consisting of the seven colours in a blending state, and these very colours distinguished sometimes by an instrument.

The above lines, I am afraid, are sufficient to indicate the view of Vaiṣṇava Philosophy about the Principle of Māyā. But in view of the great importance of this principle in

Indian Philosophy, I think it would be an omission if it is not examined a little further from the critical point of view. Indeed the theory of *Māyā* is so deep-rooted in the Indian mind, that almost every Indian young or old, male or female, be he a Hindu, an Islam or of any other caste or creed, is often and anon heard to say "all this we see is a mere illusion—it is nothing but *Maya*, the world is false, and so on". Outside India also we find philosophers that take care to know anything of Indian Philosophy interpret *Māyā* in the sense of Illusion or Dream of Dream as Mr. Cowell puts it. All these statements regarding the meaning of '*Maya*' they connect unhesitatingly with the name of the great commentator Śaṅkara. Śaṅkara's theory of the Vedānta, it might be added here, is generally interpreted by critical minds of the East and West to involve, besides the points of oneness between Brahman and individual soul, the two other points of Falsity of the world and *Māyā* as an Illusion. In the Theologic-Philosophical treatise like *Charitāmṛta* also there is a clear reference to this meaning of *Māyā* as an Illusion being associated with the name of Śaṅkara.

This Śaṅkara's theory of *Māyā* as an Illusion—strange it is that the word *Māyā* nowhere occurs throughout his commentary on the Sūtras—can be traced to his commentary on the Upanisads, and has been developed in the Sūtra—commentary. Although this theory, for reasons undefinable like the undefinable *Māyā*, has gained ground for more than a decade of centuries and has spread its influence far abroad in the west (be it said to the credit and discredit of the late lamented saint Vivekānanda), yet we do not hesitate to assert that it serves as a stumbling block to his theory of the Vedānta. With whatever subtleties he might have attempted to give a consistent exposition of this theory of *Avidyā* so

as to establish his own pet theory of Absolute Monism, the fact cannot be gainsaid that by the introduction of the principle of Avidyā he has virtually made his exposition of the Vedānta full of inconsistencies and untenable. But for this curious and inconsistent theory of Illusion, a happier reconciliation might have been effected between Śaṅkara's philosophical speculation and the philosophy of Vaiṣṇava Religion. His concept of Brahman is indeed regarded by Vaiṣṇava Philosophers as a partial exposition of the concept of Bhagavān, but his theory of maya is not at all—and cannot possibly be—recognised by them. Herein lies a fundamental difference between the two schools of thought—a difference which is inseparably connected with the difference of view in respect of the relation between the Absolute and soul. For our purpose, however, the untenability of this theory can be shown as follows.

The theory may be briefly stated thus :—On the basis of the Śruti text एकमेवाद्वितीयं ब्रह्म (Chhā. VI, 2, 1) it is to be urged that there is only one Reality Brahman, and this Brahman is devoid of all differences or attributes, and in nature is pure bliss and knowledge. This alone is existent and nothing else is existent. In association with Māyā which has the twofold Vṛttis of Vidyā and Avidyā, Brahman, when conditioned by the former i. e. Vidyā, is styled Īśvara and when by the latter is called Jīva. Brahman 'being' the only Reality, the external world originates from Ignorance or Avidyā. This Avidyā cannot be called 'being' (सत्) for being is Brahman alone, nor can it be non-being (असत्) in the strict sense, for it at any rate produces the appearance of the world (cf. अज्ञानन्तु सदसदभ्यामनिर्वचनीयं त्रिगुणान्मकं ज्ञानविरोधि भावरूपं यत् किञ्चिदिति

वदन्ति, Ved. Sara p. 8, Jacob's Edition; also-नासदरूपा न सद्
रूपा माया नैवोभयात्मिका । सद्सद्भ्यामनिर्वाच्या मिथ्याभूता
सनातनी ॥) It is in fact a principle of illusion—the unde-

finable one owing to which there seems to exist a material world, comprehending distinct individual existences. The world, in other words, is all actually Brahman, but by reason of ignorance appears to us as the world. A rope, for example, lying in certain circumstances may be mistaken by a man for a snake, he calls it a snake, it not being so however, but a rope; in other words, one may speak of the snake and the rope as being one, yet it is not meant that the rope has actually undergone a change or has turned into a snake, it is a snake merely in resemblance. As the rope is to the snake, so is Brahman to the world. By saying 'the world is Brahman' is not meant that Brahman is actually transformed into the world, but that it appears as if it were the world, the world being no entity at all. In other words, the world's existence is really Brahman's, and Brahman therefore is the illusory-material cause of the world. It is not really a material cause as clay is of the jar which is made out of it, but a substrate in the same way as the rope is to the snake or as nacre is to silver.

A thorough examination of the theory contained in the above lines is simply beyond the scope of the present treatise. Besides, we have already discussed in a previous section the point that the Absolute cannot be a Being devoid of attributes, and that what Śāṅkara describes as Brahman is nothing but a partial manifest of the Ultimate Reality Bhagavān. Leaving aside again for a future discussion the point of relation between Brahman on the one hand and Īśvara and individual soul on the other, we are here concerned with

a brief review of the theory of *Māyā* or *Avidyā* as indicated in the above lines. About this theory the *Śāstra* *dīpikā* says—
 “का पुनरियमविद्या? किं भ्रान्तिज्ञानं किं वा भ्रान्तिज्ञानकारणभूतं
 वस्त्वन्तरम्? यदि भ्रान्तिः, सा कस्य? न ब्रह्मणः, तस्य स्वच्छविद्या-
 रूपत्वात्; न हि भास्करे तिमिरस्यावकाशः सम्भवति । न जीवा-
 नाम्, तेषां ब्रह्मातिरेकिणामभावात् । भ्रान्त्यभावादेव च तत्कारणं
 वस्त्वन्तरमप्यनुपपन्नमेव । ब्रह्मातिरेकेण भ्रान्तिज्ञानं तत्कारणं वा
 अभ्युपगच्छनामद्वैतहानिः । किं कृता च ब्रह्मणोऽविद्या? न हि कार-
 णान्तरमस्ति । स्वभाविकीति चेत्, कथं विद्यास्वभावमविद्यास्वभावं
 स्यात् ॥” “But what is this Nescience? Is it misapprehen-
 sion or something else—a cause of misapprehension? If
 misapprehension, whose? Not Brahman's, for He, as you hold,
 is constitutively pure knowledge (science). In the sun there
 can be no place for darkness. Nor can it be souls', for these,
 as you hold, are not distinct from Brahman. And since,
 from your premises, misapprehension cannot exist, no more
 can a second thing—a cause thereof. Besides, if for argument's
 sake it be admitted as what subscribes to misapprehension—
 is a cause of it as an entity—additional to Brahman, Abso-
 lute-monism will evaporate. Whence again sprang Brahman's
 misapprehension? It cannot be due to any other cause than
 Brahman, for, as you hold, Brahman is the sole Entity. If
 it be said that it is natural to Brahman, how, pray, can He
 whose nature is pure knowledge, be He whose nature is
 Nescience?”

Besides, with whatever subtlety holders of the above
 theory might try to evade the point, they are forced to locate
 their *Avidyā* in Brahman, and that they actually do so
 appears from various statements¹ in which it is distinctly

1. cf. आश्रयत्वविषयत्वभागीनी निर्विभागचित्तिरेव केवला—

stated that it is Brahman that is both the subject and the object of Nescience. To avoid such awkward position and in order to be consistent with their concept of Brahman as pure, intelligent and free (नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावं ब्रह्म) they maintain that Ignorance itself is false. Most wonderful is this of all their wonders. On hearing that these Vedantists regard Avidyā as the cause of the world's appearing to be true, one would of course suppose that this Avidyā or Ignorance was understood by them to be itself true. For, if Ignorance did not actually exist, how could the world which they hold to be a nonentity have appearance? When a man mistakenly sees a snake in rope, the snake is called false, and at the same time that man's misapprehension is not said to be false but true. Moreover, the stock example of the snake-rope cannot illustrate their point at issue. They no doubt admit that Avidyā has twofold functions, viz, Āvaraṇa and Vikṣepa;¹ and with this admission and by way of analogy to the snake-rope example they say that by the function of Āvaraṇa the true nature of Brahman being concealed, the unreal world is made to appear in its stead by the force of the Vikṣepa function. But a statement like this cannot be positively affirmed of the analogue. For, though by the

Sanksepa-Sariraka. I, 316.

1. cf. अस्याज्ञानस्यावरणविक्षेपनामकमस्ति शक्तिद्वयम् । आवरणशक्तिस्तावत् अज्ञानं परिच्छिन्नमप्यात्मानमपरिच्छिन्नमसंसारिणमवलोकयितुं बुद्धिपिधायकतयाच्छादयतीव तादृशं सामर्थ्यम् । विक्षेपशक्तिस्तु यथा रज्ज्वज्ञानं स्वावृत्तरज्जौ स्वशक्त्या सर्पादिकमुद्भावयत्येवमज्ञानमपि स्वावृत्तात्मनि विक्षेपशक्त्याकाशादिप्रपञ्चमुद्भावयति तादृशं सामर्थ्यम् । (Ved. Sara pp. 13-14, Jacob's Edition).

Āvarāṇa function of darkness the true nature of a rope is concealed, by the Vikṣepa function of the same darkness the rope does not appear to be a snake in the case of all; it is mistaken for a snake by those only who have had a previous percept of a snake. Thus, while for the rope to be mistaken for a snake an additional condition, e. g., the previous percept in the seer's mind of a snake, is necessary, we cannot say that such is also the case as regards the misapprehension of the world. The Adhyāropa doctrine, therefore, which is the basis of the above theory entirely falls to the ground.

Further, it might be urged that the doctrine of falsity of the world, although it might be said to the credit of Śāṅkara that he no-where in his utterances explicitly states that the 'world is false', appears to be clearly involved in the theory of Nescience; and accordingly, an explicit statement on this point is often to be found in the writings of the followers of Śāṅkara, e.g., ब्रह्म सत्यं जगन्मिथ्या जीवो ब्रह्मैव नापरः¹ If then this doctrine of falsity of the world, i. e., of every thing else except Brahman be admitted, it would lead to the conclusion that the meaning of the texts like 'That thou art' which occasion the false utterances of these illusory Vedantists would never be capable of removing the fetters of Karmaṇ and putting an end to metempsychoses, just in the same way as all efforts for attaining real silver become fruitless if applied towards the silver misapprehended upon mere. Thus it appears that from whatever point of view it is considered, the theory of Illusion as held by the school of Śāṅkara proves to be full of inconsistencies and fallacies, and as such is to be rejected altogether. And if this theory is rejected,

1. The first line of the verse is—श्लोकं प्रवक्ष्यामि यदुक्तं
ग्रन्थकादिभिः ॥ Who wrote this verse is not known, though
it is familiar to every Vedāntin of the Śāṅkara school.

there is no other alternative than to admit that *Māyā* is a potency of *Bhagavān* whereby He is the cause of the creation etc of the entire universe of beings; and the derivative meaning of the word —“मीयते विचित्रं निर्मीयते अनया इति माया” —“that whereby the wonderful diversities of objects are created,” points to the same conclusion.

The doctrine of *Māyā* is still open to another serious objection, viz, that it almost amounts to atheism in-as-much as it describes even *Īśvara*, the Immanent Regulator of all beings, as conditioned by *Māyā* and subject to withdrawal. The atheistic character of this theory is clearly pointed out in the *Gītā* text XVI, 8—असत्यमप्रतिष्ठन्ने जगदाहुरनीश्वरम्। अपरस्परसम्भूतं किमन्यत् कामहैतुकम् ॥¹

As regards the merit of the above doctrine of *Māyā* it might be pointed out that it evinces no doubt the very great intellectual acumen and wonderful genius of its propounder—*Śaṅkara*; and amongst great philosophical theories having no religious basis it must be accorded a conspicuous place, though in the sphere of true religion instead of doing any good it serves as an impediment. Yet in doing justice we cannot but admit that the theory served some purpose at least at the time it was first propounded in-as-much as by means of its abstruse reasonings and highly logical argumen-

-
1. This text, which has been interpreted by many as referring to the Buddhistic Theory, seems to be explained by *Jiva Goswami* in his *Satsandarbhā* as referring to *Saṅkara's* theory of *māyā*. (cf. असत्यं मिथ्याभूतं सत्यासत्याभ्यामनिर्वचनीयत्वेनाप्रतिष्ठं निर्देशशून्यं स्थाणौ पुरुषत्ववत् ब्रह्मणीश्वरत्व-स्याज्ञानमात्रकल्पितत्वात् , *Param. Sandarbha*, p 261).

tations over the extreme theory of falsity of the world it diverted to some extent the minds of the then people that were solely engrossed in thoughts of mundane objects in complete forgetal of divine worship and the like.

Scriptural Texts on the Principle of Māyā:—

We think we have sufficiently indicated how the principle of Māyā as laid down in the system of Vaiṣṇava Philosophy cannot be corroborated in its detail by way of referring to, or examining, Śāṅkara's system of exposition of the Vedānta Theory, yet it can be shown how various Upaniṣad Texts do indeed support this important theory of Indian Philosophy. Thus the Śvetā. IV, 10 text says—“मायान्तु

प्रकृतिं विद्यात् मायिनन्तु महेश्वरम्,”—“Know Māyā to be Prakṛti and the great Lord Him who is associated with Māyā” (IV, 10)—associated in the sense that it is His potency. The full meaning of the text is that Māyā is that which produces various wonderful creations, and in this sense Māyā is strictly called Prakṛti which is but an emanation from Māyā, and that the Highest Person or Lord is called Māyin because He possesses the power of Māyā (such association with Māyā however is to be understood in the same sense as a lotus leaf is associated with a quantity of water put upon it). Elsewhere in the same Upaniṣad we find—अजामेकां लोहि-

तशुक्लकृष्णां वह्नीः प्रजाः सृजमानां स्वरूपाः । अजो ह्येको जुपमाणोऽनुशेते जहात्येनां भुक्त्वा भोगमजोऽयः ॥ (Śvet. IV, 5, also Mahānār. IX, 2) which, while speaking of the difference between two Ajas i.e. Jīva and Paramātmā, states also that there is another beginningless principle and that this beginningless one consisting of the three guṇas is the causality underlying manifold objects having diverse names and forms, i.e., is the same as Māyā or Prakṛti.

Again in the text इन्द्रो मायाभिः पुरुरवा इयेते "Indra goes multiform through the Māyās" (R̥k Samhitā VI, 47, 18)—the manifold powers of Indra are spoken of only because of his association with Māyā. In the Gītā text दैवी ह्येषा गुणमयी मम माया दुरत्यया, it is clearly stated that Māyā is Bhagavān's (power—मम माया). There is again the Śvetā. text—"What is perishable is the Pradhāna, the immortal and imperishable is Hara; the one God rules the perishable and the self" (क्षरं प्रधानममृताक्षरं हरः क्षरात्मनावीशते देव एकः—I, 10.) which speaks of Pradhāna as the material aspect of Māyā. It is to be noted here that the word Hara in the text means an individual soul for it draws (हरति) towards itself the Pradhāna as the object of its enjoyment. In the Kāṭha texts again—इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्थाः अर्थेभ्यश्च परं मनः । मनसस्तु परा बुद्धिर्बुद्धेरात्मा महान् परः । महतः परमव्यक्तमव्यक्तात् पुरुषः परः । पुरुषाच्च परं किञ्चित् सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः ॥ (III, 10, 11), there is a clear reference not only to the Avyakta or non-manifest Prakṛti but also to the various evolutes of the same.

It is useless to cite any more texts on this point. The cumulative evidence however of all these texts goes to show that Māyā is not something undefinable, i.e. Illusion, but is that power of the Absolute Being whereby He is the cause of the various wonderful creations that we see all around.

Chapter VI.

RELATION BETWEEN THE ABSOLUTE (BHAGAVĀN) AND INDIVIDUAL SOUL (JĪVA).

From what we have already said it is quite evident that Jīva is not identical with Bhagavān as Śāṅkara and his followers erroneously hold, but stands to Him in the relation of

difference as well as non-difference. Difference,¹ because the several characteristics of Bhagavān, viz, Infinite chit, Infinite Bliss, all-pervasiveness, omniscience, omnipotence, all-regulativeness, being the ultimate source of creation etc. in sport, the superlativeness of all attributes whatsoever, do not apply to Jīva; while the characteristics of being regulated, being affected by Māyā, which apply to Jīva, do not apply to Bhagavān. Non-difference because the several characteristics, viz (1) the constituent supersensuous ingredient of the selfhood being Chit and Bliss, (2) Eternity, (3) non-liability to any change, (4) Satyasamkalpatva apply both to Bhagavān and Jīva alike. The relation is the same as between Pūrṇa chit and chit-kaṇa, between Pūrṇa Ānanda and ānandakaṇa, between the solar disc and the rays, between fire and the flames. This relation of Achintyabhedā-bheda between God and soul is one of the distinctive features of Vaiṣṇava philosophic thought, and is such that it does not conflict with the relation conceived of in the religious speculations of all civilised nations in the world, that it is revealed to our conscience, and is quite in agreement with our reasoning. Besides, that Jīva is not identically the same as Bhagavān may be proved by lots of scriptural texts.

Thus in the first place we may refer to the text in the Chaturveda—Śikha—“असमो वा एष परो न हि कश्चिदेवं दृश्यते सर्वे त्वेते न वा जायन्ते च म्रियन्ते च, छिद्रा ह्येते भवन्त्यथ परो न जायते न म्रियते सर्वे ह्यपूर्णाश्च भवन्ति” (cited in Param. San-

1. The difference is concisely stated in the Garuda purana text

—सर्वज्ञाल्पज्ञताभेदात् सर्वशक्त्यल्पशक्तिः । स्वतन्त्र्यपार-
तन्त्र्याभ्यां सम्भोगो नेशजीवयोः ॥, quoted in Madhwa bhāṣya

p. 74,

darbhā, p 232) 'from which it appears that though Jivas resemble Brahman in-as-much as both are not subject to birth or decay, yet, because the former are not infinite, it must be admitted that there is nothing which is equal to or greater i.e. higher than Brahman. The Śveta. text again न तत्सम-

आभ्यधिकश्च दृश्यते (VI, 8) equally asserts that Brahman has no equal or superior. In the same context of this Up. there are texts which show that the Absolute Himself having no master, nor lord, nor regulator, resides within the heart of the entire universe of beings, and lords it over them, controls them, and regulates them. In other words, the fact that the Absolute is the Immanent Regulator and Lord of all beings clearly indicates a relation of difference between the two.

Referring to the Ved. Sūtras themselves, we find the relation between Brahman and Jiva described in the Sūtras 1, 2-12, II, 1-22, 11, 3-42-45. The Sūtra 1, 2-12 is विशेषणञ्च. As to the meaning of this Sūtra both Rāmānuja and Valadeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa agree in saying that it has a tacit reference to the third section of the Kath. Up. Everywhere in this section we meet with statements of distinctive attributes of the two Selves, viz, that the Highest Self is represented as all-knowing, and as the object of meditation and attainment, while the individual Self or Jiva is represented as devoid of knowledge (in the sense that the intrinsic nature of knowledge is thrown into the background by the influence of Māyā) and as the meditating and attaining subject. Such distinctive attributes would be quite unmeaning had there been identity between the Highest Self and Jiva.

The Sūtra 11, 1-22 is "अधिकन्तु भेदनिर्देशात्". Irrespective of the views of different schools of commentators, the

very wording of the Sūtra unambiguously states the superiority of Brahman over Jiva. This superiority is based upon the declaration of difference in various scriptural texts. Accordingly, Rāmānuja cites on this point quite a good number of texts, viz—"He who dwells in the self and within the self, whom the self does not know, of whom the self is the body, who rules the self within, He is thy Self, the ruler within, the Immortal" (Vṛh. Up. III, 7, 22); "Knowing as separate the self and the Mover, blessed by him he gains Immortality" (Śvet. U 1, 6); 'He is the cause, the Lord of the lords of the organs.' (i. e. of the individual souls which are lords of the organs); 'One of them eats the sweet fruit; without eating, the other looks on' (Śvet. Up. IV, 6); "There are two, the one knowing, the other not-knowing, both unborn, the one a ruler, the other not a ruler' (Śvet. Up. 1, 9); "Embraced by the Prajñā self" (Vṛh. up. IV, 3, 21); "The master of the Pradhāna and of the souls, the lord of the guṇas' (Śvet. Up. VI, 16) "Who moves within the unevolved, of whom the unevolved is the body, whom the unevolved does not know; who moves within the Imperishable (soul), of whom the Imperishable (soul) is the body, whom the Imperishable (soul in the state of bondage) does not know, who moves within Death, of whom Death is the body, whom Death does not know; He is the Inner Self of all beings, free from evil, the Divine One, the one God Nārāyaṇa (Nārā. Up.)

The Sūtra II, 3-43 is "अंशो नानाव्यपदेशादन्यथा चापि दाशकितवादित्वमर्थयित एके". Just as Vādarāyaṇa makes a positive unambiguous statement of Kṛṣṇa being the Absolute Lord in the Bhāg. text "एते चांशकलाः.....रुण्णस्तु भगवान् स्वयम्," so in the present Sūtra he gives a positive utterance as to the fact that Jiva or individual soul is a part of the

Absolute. Śaṅkara, in his obstinate bias for establishing the purely monistic theory, explains the word अंश in the Sūtra by way of supplying from his own creative brain a new word इव, and says “अंश इव अंशः, “The soul is part as it were, i.e. appears like a part of Brahman under the influence of Avidyā, but is not really so—really identical with Brahman”. Such forced interpretation is indeed consistent with his own theory that Brahman is a Formless Being; but it is an interpretation which, instead of helping at all, interrupts the unfolding of the true meaning which the author of the Sūtras had in mind. The natural interpretation and faithful rendering of the Sūtra however is what we find in Rāmāṇja and Vidyābhūṣaṇa. “The Sūtra declares”, says Rāmāṇja, “that the Soul is a part of Brahman; since there are declarations of difference and also otherwise i.e. declarations of unity. To the former class belong all those texts which dwell on नाना व्यपदेश or various kinds of distinction i.e. the distinction of the creator and the created, the ruler and the ruled, the all-knowing and small-knowing, the pure and the impure, the independent and the dependent, the Lord and the dependent, that which is endowed with auspicious qualities and that which possesses qualities of an opposite kind. To the latter class belong such texts as ‘Thou art that’, and ‘this self is Brahman’. The significance of this latter class of texts is more clearly pointed out and illustrated in the last part of the Sūtra. According to all the commentators—Śaṅkara included, the last part of the Sūtra has a tacit reference to the Atharva-Vedic text—ब्रह्म दाशा ब्रह्म दासा ब्रह्मे कितवा उत”. In explaining this text of the At!arva-Veda, Śaṅkara, as usual, invents a new word एव (ब्रह्मैव दासाः etc).

and thereby establishes the relation of complete identity between Brahman and Jiva. The proper meaning however is that it refers to the general non-difference or similarity between Brahman and Jiva in respect of the common characteristics of Bliss and Knowledge. This general non-difference, along with the difference indicated above, amounts to the theory of Achintya-Bhedābheda which Vaiṣṇava Philosophy seeks to establish. The reference, again, in the Atharva text to the Dāsas (a low class of Hindus called fishermen), the Dāsas (serving class of people) and the Kitavas (gamblers) in preference to beings of the many higher classes and types, has some hidden significance. As we have already said, religion in its true sense of 'Faith in the Absolute and practice thereof up to its consummation' can not be the sole birth right of a few select classes of people. The Bhāgavata texts clearly state that the cult of Bhakti is open to all classes of people irrespective of their caste, creed, sex or age or social status. Herein lies one of the many excellences of the Bhakti Cult, and this no doubt is a great happy triumph over the Brahmanical bigotry and narrowness based upon too blind orthodoxy which the Smṛti texts—specially the Navya Smṛtis of Raghunandana and others—have inculcated and whereby they have unfortunately wrought out a stumbling block in the path of progress—religious, social, political or moral. Moreover, this reference to gamblers etc reminds one of the gītā text अपि चेत् सुदुराचारो भजते मामनन्यभाक् । साधुरेव स मन्तव्यः सम्यग् व्यवसितोहि सः ॥. What the Gītā text means in this—The efficacy of devotional worship to Bhagavān is so very great that even if one of a very vile nature and immoral practices like Ajāmila all on a sudden under the magnetic influence of a spiritual guide forsakes his vile nature and desowns his vicious practices and then turns his whole mind

towards meditation upon God, he is notwithstanding to be regarded and estimated as a saint. True saintliness, it is here indicated, lies preeminently in unhampered and whole-hearted attention to the devotion to *Bhagavān*, not so much in outward ceremonial observances. There is no knowing when a man will be favoured with such a devotional spirit; even a wreck, a pest of the society, may all on a sudden get a complete turn of his mind, and this is to be accounted for not simply by his doings in this world but also by his past doings in previous existences. All that is meant therefore by the reference to gamblers in the above text is that divine grace and goodness is impartially directed alike to all beings whatsoever, and difference in religious realisation between these beings depends upon the degree in which the divine grace is reflected upon the individual heart of the beings.

The difference between the two Selves thus directly and positively stated in Sūtra II, 3-42 is also referred to in the Sūtra that follows. This latter sūtra means that the difference is asserted by Mantra or Scriptures. Thus, on account of the *Chhā. Up* III, 12, 6 text पादोऽस्य सर्वा भूतानि त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि, 'one part of It is called beings, three feet of It are the Immortal in the highest heaven', the soul must be held to be a part of Brahman since the word पाद in the text means a part. It is to be noted here that whereas the word अंश is used in the singular form in the preceeding Sūtra with a view to denote the whole class of souls, in the *Chhā. text* the plural form in 'all beings' denotes the plurality of souls which fact has already been established.

To this theory of 'relation between whole and part' it might be objected that if the soul is a part of Brahman all the imperfections of the soul are Brahman's also. To this objection the Sūtra II, 3 45 replies by saying—"Not so is

the Highest, i.e., imperfections of the soul cannot be ascribed to Brahman since the latter is not of the same nature as the individual soul".

It is clear therefore that in the various Śruti and Smṛti texts cited above twofold designation is distinctly stated of the soul (where the term 'Soul', not being qualified by any epithet, might refer to the Infinite Self i.e. Bhagavān, or to the finite Self i.e. Jīva), and if we are to account for this fact satisfactorily we can not but admit that Jīva is a part of Brahman, or, strictly speaking according to V. Philosophy, a part of Bhagavān as the Substratum of the Jīva-Śakti, and not of Bhagavān the manifestor of the Swarūpa-Śaktis.¹

While establishing the Bheḍābheda indicated above as the natural and real relation between Bhagavān and Jīva, Vaiṣṇava Philosophy however is not blind to those texts of the Scriptures which signify ultimate absorption of Jīva in Brahman. On the basis of his natural relation a Jīva indeed takes to devotion as the only function in religion, but the nature of the ultimate realisation or attainment of the

1. Such precise statement about the relation between Bhagavan and Jīva we find in the Param. Sandarbha pp. 235-36, where Jīva Goswami, in his explanation of the Bhag. text—

“स्वकृतपुरेण्वमीष्वयहिरन्तरसंवरणं तव पुरुषं वदन्त्यखिल-
शक्तिधृतोऽंशकृतम्”, says—“अखिलशक्तिधृतः सर्वशक्तिधर-
स्येति विशेषणं जीवशक्तिविशिष्टस्यैव तव जीवोऽंशो न तु
शुद्धस्य इति गमयित्वा जीवस्य तच्छक्तिरूपत्वेनैवांशत्वमित्य-
नेनैवांशत्वमित्येतद् वञ्चयन्ति ।” It is to be noted further
that some of the Bhag. texts on the point of relation are—

- (a) एष ह्यंशेयसत्त्वानामात्मांशः परमात्मनः
आद्योऽवतारो यत्रासौ भूतग्रामो विभाव्यते ॥
(b) एकस्यैव ममांशस्य जीवस्यैव महामते ।
यन्धोऽस्याविद्ययानादेर्धिया च तथेततः ॥

summumbonum depends upon the nature of the highest object of his desire. If he wants Sāyujya Mukti, he will ultimately merge in Brahman or lose his own personal self in the illimitable halo of lustre of the supersensuous limbs of Bhagavān; if again he hankers after Premānanda, he will retain the reality of his own self as well as the relation of difference till the end, and go on eternally in devotion and servitude. In this way a reconciliation can be brought about between the two classes of texts, those that signify difference and those that teach non-difference.

The relation of non-identity between the Absolute and Soul, which is indicated above, might be strengthened further by means of various Śruti texts. Thus from the Mund. texts—
 द्वा सुपर्णा सयुजा सखाया समानं वृक्षं परिपस्वजाते । तयोरन्यः
 पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्त्यनश्नन्नन्योऽमित्राकशीति ॥ समाने वृक्षे पुरुषो निम-
 न्नोऽनीशया शोचति मुह्यमानः । जुष्टं यदा पश्यत्यन्यमीशमस्य मदि-
 मानमेति वीतिशोकः ॥ (III, 1, 1-2) it appears that Jiva and
 Īśvara (Paramātmā) like two birds as it were, simultaneously
 occupy one and the same tree-like heaven, the corporeal
 frame; of these, the former suffers weal and woe as the result
 of acts of diverse kinds, while the latter not being so ever
 remains Self-luminous. The one being deluded by Māyā is
 affected with endless miseries, and when it fortunately sights
 the other, i.e., Lord as One different from itself and always
 to be devoted and worshipped, then it goes to the supreme
 heaven of the Lord, and thereby there takes place an extinc-
 tion of all its miseries. In the same Up. the text that closely
 follows, viz, यदा पश्यः पश्यते हृक्मवर्णं कर्त्तारमीशं पुरुषं ब्रह्मयो-
 निम् । तदा विद्वान् पुण्यपापे विधूय निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति ॥
 clearly says that intrinsically there exists not—साम्य i.e.
 dissimilarity between Īśa and Soul, though a similarity might

be attained in release. The latter fact again indicates that even in release there always exists a difference between Lord and Jīva, for the word साम्य does not mean absolute identity, and hence the real intrinsic difference between the Lord and Jīva cannot be denied. Lastly, with an eye to this very difference the texts run—नित्यो नित्यानां चेतनश्चेतनानाम् एको बहूनां यो विदधाति कामान् । तमात्मस्थं ये अनुपश्यन्ति धीरास्तेषां शान्तिः शाश्वती नेतरेषाम् ॥ Kath. 5, 13; the first line also occurring in Śvet. VI, 13).

If, therefore, there exists this relation of Bheda-bheda between Brahman and Jīva, what then is the meaning of the text सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म? Just as the different senses—speech and the like, though really dependent upon the Prāṇa, are sometimes described as Prāṇas, similarly the world (including the Jīvas), though dependent upon the One Brahman, is described as Brahman.

In conclusion, the relation between Bhagavān and Jīva, which is established in the above passages, may be definitely stated as one between master and servant, and to establish this definite and precise relation is the distinctive feature and happy triumph of Vaiṣṇava Philosophy. Thus the Śvetā. VI, 7 text—तमीश्वराणां परमं महेश्वरं ते देवतानां परमञ्च दैवतम् । पतिं पतीनां परमं परस्ताद् विदाम् देवं भुवनेशमीड्यम् ॥ states how soul's master is the Lord. Similarly, in the Padma-purāṇa there is a distinct utterance to the same effect, viz, दासभूतो हरेरेव नान्यस्यैव कदाचन—Jīva is the servant of Hari alone and of none else.

If we want to examine more critically and scrutinisingly the important topic of relation between the Absolute and Soul, we cannot but refer to the two corollary theories that are inseparably connected with the main problem of the

purely monistic theory of the Vedānta. These theories are—(1) The Avachhedavāda or the Appropriation Theory, (2) The Prativimba-Vāda or the Reflexion Theory. Let us examine each in detail.

(1) The Avachheda-Vāda—Holders of this theory maintain that the only Reality is Brahman—the non-differenced Substance; that Māyā is something indescribable, neither being nor non-being; that Māyā has two aspects—Vidyā and Avidyā; that Īśvara is nothing but Brahman as appropriated to the Vidyā aspect, while soul or Jīva is the same Brahman as appropriated to the Avidyā or more accurately to the Product of Avidyā, e.g., the internal organs (जीवो नाम अन्तःकरणवच्छिन्नं चैतन्यम्—Vedānta Paribhāṣā, p. 8); and that when the indescribable Māyā or Avidyā is dispelled by means of Right Apprehension, nothing remains but Brahman. The difference thus appearing, according to the theory, between Īśvara and Jīva is illustrated by them by way of analogy to the appropriation of the whole expanse of ether to a pot having a very wide mouth and to one having a narrow mouth e.g. a jar. In other words, just as one and the same ether, when appropriated to or limited by the adjunct like a wide-mouthed pot, is considered larger than the same ether appropriated to a jar (of narrow mouth), so also one and the same Brahman appropriated to Māyā taken in its entirety is called Īśvara and appropriated to its product the internal organ is called Jīva which is thus lesser than Īśvara.

The being appropriated of Brahman no doubt implies according to this view that there must be connection first with Māyā. But the question is—which is the Āśraya or subject of this connection? As we know from the Saṃkṣepa Śāriraka, It is Brahman and Brahman alone that is both Viśaya and Āśraya (cf. आश्रयत्वविषयत्वभगिनी निर्विभगचिति-

रेव केवला, "The impartite Chaitanya or Brahman alone is the subject and object of Ignorance"). Brahman thus becoming the subject of Ignorance would necessarily, according to their view, become the sufferer of endless miseries. But it might be said against this—what transgression Brahman must have committed that It would have to suffer such endless miseries and be put to such a pitiable state as is the case with phenomenal beings? To avoid this anomalous position these theorists would cite a maxim—which all other systems subscribe to—that "An affirmation or a negation, when predicated of anything together with its associate, if debarred from the object substantive, is to be referred to the object adjective (सविशेषणे हि विधिनिषेधौ विशेष्ये वाधे सति विशेषणमुपसंक्रामतः—quoted in the Ved. Paribhāṣā); and on the basis of this maxim they would urge that though the defects due to the limiting adjunct exist in Jīvas, they would nevertheless be debarred from Brahman. But if we care to understand the true meaning and application in the present case of this maxim, it would appear that though thereby one difficulty appears to be removed, there would arise another anomaly which cannot be explained away. In other words, according to their interpretation and applicativeness of the maxim cited it is the internal organ and not Brahman appropriated which they ought to consider to be soul. The word विशेषण in the maxim means "that whereby a thing (e.g. Brahman in the present case) is limited or appropriated", as such the internal organ is the विशेषण here. It is quite evident, therefore, that the language of these theorists on this point is simply a deceptive one.

It is to be noted here that the untenability of Māyā as the limiting adjunct lies at the root of the untenability of the Appropriation Theory. It is shown above how the theory

falls to the ground if we accept the meaning of *Māyā* as something indescribable—neither being nor non-being. Let us now examine what follows in case we take the word *Māyā* either in the sense of 'being' i.e. real, or in the sense of not-being i.e. unreal.

In the first case: (1) Since the word छेद in *Avachheda* derivatively means splitting up into two or more parts, on the analogy of a mountain split up into larger and smaller slabs of stone we can never say distinctively that *Īśwara* is the larger portion of *Brahmah* split up while *Jīva* is the smaller part, the reason being that all scriptural texts—*Śruti* and *Smṛti*—which they also cite as authority, describe *Brahman* as अचक्षेद्य i.e. not capable of being split up, and as अखण्ड or *Impartite*. (b) Nor can it be urged that the limiting adjunct is joined to a part of *Brahman* which however remains intact as a complete whole, for in that case the constant changeability (admitted by this class of thinkers) of the adjunct would necessarily imply a changeability of *Brahman*—a fact which is never admitted by these appropriation-ists. (c) If again it is redargued that *Brahman* in its entirety is in contact with the adjunct, it would follow on the ground of the eternity of the adjunct that there is no scope for the existence of *Brahman* as *Pure Chit*. (d) Further, if it be urged that *Brahman* as appropriated to the adjunct eternally exists in the two aspects of *Īśwara* and *Jīva*, that would imply that even in *Release* (*Mukti*) there exist *Īśwara* and *Jīva*—a fact contrary to their meaning of *Release*.

In the second case:—Since the adjunct is regarded as unreal like a snake wrongly apprehended in a rope, any contact with this unreal thing would reduce *Brahman* to an unreality which is quite in conflict with their main problem. Besides, the example of the jar-appropriated ether cited by

by the appropriationists does not tally with the fact of the adjunct-appropriated chaitanya in-as-much as even the practical reality which is predicated by them of the jar and ether is denied of the adjunct.

Thus it appears that the appropriation—theory cannot be upheld from whatever point of view it be considered and examined.

2 The Reflexion Theory :—

Two views of this Theory we find stated in the Vedānta Paribhāṣa. (A) Some hold that Īśvara-Intelligence, which is meant by the word 'that' (in 'That thou art') and which is described by means of essential and secondary characteristics is a reflexion (of Absolute Intelligence—Brahman) in Māyā. This is what they mean:—Absolute Intelligence only is common to (i. e. as constitutive of) Īśvara and the Jīva. Īśvara is the reflexion of that same object (Absolute Intelligence) in Māyā which is Nescience. Jīva-intelligence is the reflexion of Brahman in the various internal organs. For thus the scripture declares—"That which has the product (the internal organ) as its limiting condition is the Jīva, That which has the cause (Nescience) as its limiting condition is Īśvara." According to this view the difference between Jīva and Īśvara is like the difference between the reflexion of the sun on a lake and on the water in a cup. And since the limiting condition Nescience (in the one case) is pervasive, Īśvara who is conditioned by it is also pervasive, and because the internal organ is of limited extent, the Jīva which is limited by it is also of limited extent.

(B). According the above view the defects due to Nescience would attach to Īśvara as they do to Jīva, because a limiting condition gives its own tinge to the reflexion it conditions. But since this view does not accord with Īśvara's true nature, another school have maintained that Īśvara is the object

reflected. And this is what they mean—"Intelligence is one alone. Īśwara=intelligence is that which has become the reflected object. Jiva=intelligence is the reflexion. If the doctrine that there is only one Jiva be held, Nescience is the limiting condition through which the surmised of the reflected object and reflexion is reflected; but if a plurality of Jivas be maintained, the internal organs are the limiting conditions. The difference between Jiva and Īśwara is due to the limiting condition, and the defects due to the limiting condition exist only in Jiva—the reflexion and not in Īśwara—the thing reflected, for the prejudices of the limiting condition attach to the reflexion only. According to this theory the difference between Jiva and Īśwara corresponds to the difference between the real sun in the sky and the sun which shines as a reflexion in water."

A similar statement is also to be found in the following verse of the Hastāmālaka attributed to Śaṅkara

मुखामासको दर्पणे दृश्यमानो

मुखत्वात् पृथक्त्वेन नैवास्ति वस्तु ।

चिदाभासको धीषु जीवोऽपि तद्वत्

स नित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपोऽहमात्मा ॥

"I am that Spirit—constitutively Eternal Apprehension, which manifests itself as soul. For, similar to the reflexion of the face beheld in a mirror,—which reflexion is nothing whatsoever taken apart from the face—, is the soul the reflexion of Intelligence or Spirit in intellects (i. e. internal organs)"

Against this theory it might be said that reflexion is not at all possible of Brahman which according to their view is devoid of attributes, which has no form, which is not to be seen, and which is all-pervasive. The distinction between the object reflected and its image is quite contradictory to the all-

pervasiveness of Brahman, for, if reflexion be admitted, it cannot but be admitted at the same time that there is a distinct space for the image to lie in, but this very portion of the space has already been occupied by the all-pervading Brahman and cannot therefore be simultaneously occupied by the image of Brahman. In the case of the sun's reflexion in water which they refer to by way of analogy, it is the sun having a definite form and distinctive attributes, and not a formless attributeless substance, that is reflected. As an instance of the reflexion of a pervading thing they cite the case of the reflexion in water of the pervading Ether (Ākāśa); but this is quite contrary to facts, for nowhere on the surface of the earth the mere Ether is found to be reflected; it is the formed attributive and visible objects like plants, stars etc existing in Ether that are found to be reflected in water. As to their statement that 'a reflection of colour which is itself colourless is a common fact, (न च रूपहीनस्य ब्रह्मणो न प्रतिबिम्बसम्भवः रूपवत एव तथात्वदर्शनादिति वाच्यम् , नीरूपस्यापि रूपस्य प्रतिबिम्बदर्शनात् , Ved. Paribhāsa, p. 42)',—Our reply is that nowhere is found to be reflected colour as such in its entire abstraction from a substance; colour is indeed reflected but in every case it is reflected as inhering in a substance. On the cumulative evidence of all these facts the Reflexion = theory of the rival Vedāntist appears to be a very trifling—nay, a childish one, and as such is to be rejected on the very face of it.

It will not be out of place here to refer to the way in which Viṣṇūāna Bhikṣu meets this doctrine of the Reflexion Theory. Thus he says in his Yoga Bhāṣya Vārttika—“प्रतिबिम्बस्य तुच्छत्वे प्रतिबिम्बरूपजीवस्य बिम्बरूपब्रह्मणा सह अभेदानुपपत्तिः सदसदोरभेदानुपपत्तेः । अतुच्छत्वे चाऽभ्यनानात्वस्य शब्दभेदेन स्वीकरोपत्तिरद्वैताद्यनुपपत्तिश्चेति ॥” “If a reflexion be

a non-entity, the soul—a reflexion cannot be identical with Brahman the object reflected, for there can be no identity between entity and non-entity. And if it be not a non-entity, multiplicity of souls will be indirectly acknowledged and pure monism will go un-demonstrated”.

Further, it might be urged that the theory presents to the reader some more objections. In the first place, since according to their view everything else except Brahman is false, reflexions of every description—whether of objects in a mirror or the lake, or of Brahman in the internal organ—are false, literally false as nacrine silver is, not false as the Sāṃkhya maintains them to be. Secondly, there is the absurdity of comparing a reflexion and what is reflected to nacrine silver and nacre; and again, if the soul which is laid down as being a reflexion of Brahman is after all nothing but Brahman, how can it be subject to error? If the soul be a reflexion not when it is viewed as Brahman but only when it is misapprehensively viewed as a reflexion and as something different from Brahman, it comes out that this is non-entity. Thirdly, who is it that sees the soul as a reflexion? For the soul itself is proved to be nothing, and Brahman is not liable to error and therefore a third party is needed to make an error here possible.

Meaning of ‘That thou art’.

We have seen how Vaiṣṇava Philosophy does not ignore altogether Śaṅkara’s theory of Brahman as a non-differenced Substance and his concept of Release which consists in the absolute merge of an individual soul in Brahman. What Śaṅkara describes as Nirviśeṣa Brahman is nothing but a lower stage of the concept of Bhagavān which is otherwise called Saviśeṣa Brahman, and consequently his concept of Release, also called Sāyujya Mukti, is a lower stage of realisation which one following the Jñāna Mārga may reach, subject

of course to his implicit faith in Bhagavān at the outset. Thus it appears that the difference in this respect between the two schools of thought is one of degree only. The fundamental difference however arises in respect of the relation between the Absolute and soul. This relation Śāṅkara describes as absolute oneness or identity and is, according to him, based upon the four scriptural texts viz., (a) प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्म, (b) अहं ब्रह्मास्मि, (c) तत्त्वमसि, and, (d) अयमात्मा ब्रह्म, collected from the four Vedas proper. These texts he regards as the four mahāvākyas of the Vedas, and interprets in his own way so as to establish by any means his own pet theory of Brahman. Before we go on to examine critically his method of interpretation we should consider first whether the texts are mahāvākyas at all. Now a mahāvākya possesses three principal characteristics, viz, (1) that it must be a positive unambiguous assertion of a truth, (2) that it must be a concise statement of the various truths sought to be established by the scriptures taken as a whole, (3) that it must contain within itself a happy reconciliation of the apparently diverse meanings of all other texts occurring in the Scripture. Although the first characteristic may any how be supposed to be present in the above four texts, it cannot be thought from Śāṅkara's method of interpretation that the two others are also present there. All that we can say therefore is that the texts in question are not mahāvākyas, but only partial utterances found in the Vedas.¹

-
1. The four texts occur respectively in Rik. Ait V. 3, Yajuh Vrih. 4, 10, Saman Chha, and Atharvan. To an unbiased reasoning mind it is the Pranava or Omkara (ॐ) and not these texts, that appears to be the Mahavakya of the Vedas. This is also the view of the Charitamrita as we come to know from the following verse, viz.—Pranava hi Mahavakya vedera nidana | Isvara Swarupa Pranava Saivavishvadhama ||

The general method adopted by Śaṅkara and his followers in interpreting Scriptural texts and the Vedānta Sūtras is open to the grave objection that they often times take recourse to the processes of Adhyāhāra and Lakṣaṇā Vṛtti. The former, as we come to know from the commentary on Amara-koṣa, consists in "making explicit and clear, by means of words outside the text in question, the meaning otherwise vague or supplying new words from outside the text in order to make out a complete sense". Whatever meaning be accepted, the process of Adhyāhāra always depends upon the condition of necessity; in other words, this process is to be resorted to only when we are forced to do so for the sake of a sensible or connected meaning. As we have already shown in our discussion of the Ved. Sūtras that speak of the relation between the Absolute and soul, Śaṅkara unnecessarily supplies words like इव and एव where without this the meaning is quite clear. Besides, his Adhyāhāra of the word Avidyā in the curious way he does is not warranted either by the Sūtras themselves or by the texts cited by him.

The latter process, viz, Lakṣaṇā Vṛtti is thus described in the Sāhitya Darpaṇa—मुख्यार्थवाधे तदयुक्तो ययान्यो ऽर्थः प्रतीयते । रूढेः प्रयोजनाद्वासौ लक्षणा शक्तिरर्पिता ॥ ; the commentary runs thus—कलिङ्गः साहसिक इत्यादौ कलिङ्गादिशब्दो देशविशेषादिरूपे स्वार्थे असम्भवन् यया शब्दस्य शक्त्या स्वसंयुक्तान् पुरुषादीन् प्रत्याययति, यया च गङ्गायां घोष इत्यादौ गङ्गादिशब्दो जलमयाद्यर्थवाचकत्वात् प्रकृतेऽसम्भवन् स्वस्य सामीप्यादिसम्बन्धसम्बन्धिनं तदार्थं लक्षयति, सा शब्दस्यार्पिता स्वाभाविकेतरा ईश्वरानुद्भाविता वा शक्तिर्लक्षणा नाम ।

The meaning of these lines is this—In the instance Kalinga is brave, the word Kalinga cannot possibly be taken in its literal sense of a 'country' and so is necessitated to signify the persons inhabiting that 'country', otherwise the connection with the predicate word 'brave' would not be established. Similarly, in the expression 'A ghosa (one belonging to the agricultural class of people) in the Ganges', the word 'Ganges' cannot be taken in the ordinary sense of accumulated water with current etc', but must out of necessity be understood in the sense of 'bank of the river Ganges'; otherwise the sentence would be unmeaning. Thus it appears that by Laksanā is meant that potency of words whereby they, on the sublation of the literal or natural import, signify something connected with the natural meaning, and this potency is different from the natural potency of words, i. e., does not follow necessarily from the characteristics of Śābda Brahman or Eternal Word, and is conditioned by traditional usage or by a necessity for serving some purpose. Laksanā Vṛtti therefore is something which seems not to be intended by the Divinity of Eternal Word—a manifestation of the Absolute; nor is it to be resorted to in those cases where the natural meaning would serve the purpose equally well.

With these preliminary observations let us try to interpret the above scriptural texts so as to arrive at the idea of the real relation between Brahman and Jīva. Of the four texts, again, the text 'That thou art' is regarded as the most important by different schools of thought; and, this being explained, all the others would be explained thereby. Hence it is that a critical exposition of the text 'That thou art' is undertaken.

The text occurs several times in the sections 8-16 of the sixth chapter of the Chhā.Up. The word 'That' refers to Brahman Omniscient etc, which had been introduced as the general

topic of consideration in previous passages of the same section such as तदैक्षत बहु स्याम् प्रजायेय, "It thought may I be many"; and the word 'Thou', as appears from the context, refers to Jiva which stands as an Upalakṣaṇa for the manifold objects referred to in 'may I be many'. These two words are coordinated by the copula verb 'art'. On account of this coordination the school of Śāṅkara urging for absolute oneness between the two argues thus—"why may not the purport of the reference to the same object in the words 'That art thou' be undifferentiated essence, the unity of souls, these words ('That' and 'thou') having a reciprocally implicate power by abandonment of opposite portions of their meaning as is the case in the phrase—"This is that Devadatta". In the words 'This is that Devadatta, we understand by the word 'that' a person in relation to a different time and place, and by the word 'this' a person in relation to the present time and place. That both are one and the same is understood by the form of predication (reference to the same object). Now as one and the same thing cannot at the same time be known as in different times and places, the two words 'This' and 'that' must refer to the essence and not to the accidents of time and place, and unity of essence can thus be understood. Similarly, in the text 'That thou art', there is implicated an indivisible essence by abandonment of the contradictory portions (of the denotation), viz, finite cognition (which belongs to the individual soul or Thou) and infinite cognition (which belongs to the Real or Undivided soul". Gough's Trans. of the Sarva Darśana Samgraha)

In this argument there are three main points to be noted, viz-(1) that by means of the form of predication or coordination there is meant absolute oneness between 'that' and 'thou'; (2, that this meaning of absolute oneness comes in by way of

sublation of the opposite portions of their meaning; (3) that the sublation of the opposite portions of their meaning is brought to light by means of the process called Lakṣaṇā Vṛtti or implicativeness attached to the two words as in the case of the example 'This is that Devadatta'.

Following the lines of Rāmānuja we might say here that since the general principle of co-ordination means that one thing subsists in twofold forms, the two words in the text must be understood in the two different aspects or modes of one and the same thing, otherwise the entire principle of coordination would be given up. Accordingly, the word 'Thou' in the text which stands in co-ordination to 'That' must be understood in the sense of the same Omniscient Brahman in so far as having for its part or body the individual souls connected with unintelligent matter. Nor is there any necessity for taking recourse to the Vṛtti of Lakṣaṇā in order to sublimate the contradictory portions of the meaning of the two words in the analogous sentence cited above, for there is no contradiction in the cognition of the oneness of a thing connected with the past (that Devadatta) on the one hand, and the present (this) on the other, in-as-much as any contradiction supposed to arise from relation to different places may be avoided by a supposed difference of time, the existence in the distant place being past and that in the near being present. Similarly, in the text in question to take recourse to implicativeness is quite unnecessary, because, if we take the words 'that' and 'thou' in their natural meaning as stated above, it would not impede in any way the expression by means of the coordination of a sensible connected meaning, and would fully serve the purpose of arriving at a relation between Brahman and Jiva. Besides, as already stated, implication is never intended by Īśvara or the Eter-

nal word, and when Śaṅkar and his followers, like Vaiṣṇava philosophers, admit the Vedas to be 'Eternal words'—the direct revelation of Brahman, the implied meaning which they attach to the words 'that' and 'thou' can not in their view also be intended by Brahman. And in that case they are bound to accede to the natural meaning and thereby to admit that the relation is not absolute oneness but relative oneness i.e. oneness in some respect and difference in others. Moreover, if the text were meant to express absolute oneness, it would conflict with the previous statement in the same section, viz—'It thought, may I be many'; and further, the promise already made in the same section that 'by the knowledge of One thing all things are known' could not be considered as fulfilled. As to the other point, viz, that the meaning of absolute oneness comes in by way of sublation of the contradictory portions of the meaning, it might be urged also that when we form the sublative judgment like 'this is not silver', the sublation is founded on an independent positive judgment, viz, 'this is a shell'; in the case under discussion, however, the sublation would not be known through an independent positive judgment but would be assumed merely on the ground that it cannot be helped. For all these considerations we are led to conclude that the relation of absolute oneness or identity between the Absolute and soul does not follow at all from the text 'That Thou art' which therefore means:— "There is sameness between the two selfs in so far as both are knowledge and bliss and both are eternal; and difference at the same time for while the one is Infinite the other is finite, the one is Regulator the other is a thing regulated, the one is pervasive the other is pervaded, the existence of one is absolutely real that of the other is relatively so, and so on." This interpretation is to be accepted also because

it avoids all conflict with various other scriptural passages, viz.—‘Him the great Lord, the Highest of Lords’ (Śvet Up VI, 7); ‘His high power is revealed as manifold’ (Śvet VI.8), ‘Abiding within, the Ruler of beings, the Self of all, He who dwells in the earth, different from the earth, whom the earth does not know, whose body the earth is, who rules the earth within—He is the Self—the Ruler within the immortal—He who dwells in the Self’ (Vīh Up. III, 7, 3, 22). Nor must it be redargued that on this interpretation of the text there is no decisiveness as to which of the two terms is meant to make an original assertion with regard to the other, for, as appears from the whole context of the section of the Up., this text does not mean at all to make an original assertion, it is merely a special expression of the truth already propounded in the previous clause ‘In That all this has its Self.’

The relation of inequality between the two selves, which is thus shown to be indicated by the text by means of an argumentation carried on according to the principles of Rhetorics and Hindu Logic, may also be brought to light if we examine the text once more from the point of view of the principles of Western Logic. No doubt the sentence ‘That thou art’ is a logical proposition, and as such all the guiding principles of a logical proposition can be shown to apply to it. Before the proposition is logically explained it is meet therefore to say something about the principles that we are going to apply.

Propositions are generally classified into Verbal or Analytic, and Real or Synthetic, according as the connotation of the predicate term is or is not included in the connotation of the subject term. This division of judgments however, is often objected to by logicians like Professor Vitch and Bradley on the ground that it is purely subjective, and consequently

they reduce all judgments into the analytic character; but this is simply to confound the personal history of an individual mind with the general method of knowledge with which alone Logic is concerned, and hence the classification cannot but be upheld. On the basis of this classification the proposition 'Thou art that' is to be regarded Real, and the reason is this:—Previous to this text in the same section after the statement 'It thought may I be many' an elaborate description is given about the manifold objects, the souls are included in these manifold objects and are found to reside always in corporeal frames. From the transient nature of these frames it might appear to the mind of Śvetaketu that the souls also are transient like their dwelling places—the bodies. And to remove this doubt and confusion an explicit statement is made by way of a proposition in which Brahmanhood (That) is predicated of the soul (Thou). The predicate thus affirms something definite and new of the subject 'thou' in-as-much as the characteristics of knowledge, bliss, eternity etc, belonging to the connotation of 'that', were not present in the doubting mind of Śvetaketu as included in the connotation of 'Thou' (Soul). The question now is, whether the predicate taken in its connotative aspect is affirmed in toto or partially of the subject. To decide this we must go further to state that, the proposition being an affirmative one, its predicate is undistributed. Indeed Hamilton and his followers on the basis of the doctrine of quantification of the predicate recognise four additional forms of propositions besides A. I. E and O. Of these the U and Y forms, as appears from Mr. Keynes's view, receive some recognition in Logic. The U form is that universal affirmative proposition in which the predicate is distributed i.e. of the type All S is All P. But it is to be distinctly remembered that for the admissibility

of such propositions of the U class there are two essential conditions, viz (1) that there is an unmistakable affirmation that the subject and the predicate are co-extensive (eg in the case of all definitions), or (2) that the subject and the predicate are singular terms. In the proposition 'That thou art' we cannot say that the first condition is fulfilled, for the alleged co-extensivity between 'that' and 'thou' is to be proved by means of this text, and till it is undisputedly proved the alleged relation cannot be accepted as true. Nor can it be said that the subject and the predicate here are singular terms. The subject 'thou', though appearing to be a singular term, is not really so, for it stands not for one single individual soul but for the class of individual souls. Thus there is no doubt that the predicate 'That' of the proposition is undistributed. This undistributedness of the predicate 'That' considered along with the denotative—connotative Import of propositions, would imply that 'of the endless attributes of Brahman (That) only some i. e. the characteristics of Bliss, Knowledge, Eternity are predicated of soul'. In other words, the text implies that there is the sameness or equality between Brahman and Jiva in so far as those characteristics are concerned.

The same conclusion would be arrived at if we consider the bearing of the Fundamental Laws of Thought upon logical propositions. The Principle of Identity, it is admitted by all, explains clearly the justification of the judgment. It applies therefore to all affirmative propositions. There is however no difficulty in understanding its guiding force in such propositions as 'A is A', 'B is B'; in other words, the bearing of this principle upon analytical judgments is quite clear. But in such statements there is conveyed no real information. To say 'a thing is itself' tells no more about it, than does the bare mention of its name (for this reason some

logicians are inclined to include analytic propositions in the class of terms). Identity must be interpreted in such a way as to cover such propositions as 'A is B' or 'Gold is yellow'. In other words, the principle of Identity would be prominently shown as an underlying principle of it is applied to Real propositions. Accordingly, in the proposition 'Thou art that' there is really expressed Identity; but this identity is to be understood not in the sense of absolute oneness but in the sense of identity amidst diversity. The two terms in such cases have not the same signification and hence the proposition in which they are conjoined is capable of giving real information. In truth, it is only amidst some diversity that identity is conspicuously known at all. We are therefore led to conclude that the text 'That thou art', when properly understood, means nothing but that 'there is some difference between the Absolute and an individual soul, besides sameness in some respects'.

The relation of inequality between the two selfs being thus established, if it is asked why is it that in the scriptural text तत्त्वमसि the Jiva is described with reference to the points of similarity and not to the difference, the answer is as follows:—Suppose a man has been confined from birth in a dark prison=cell and consequently has never known what the sun is; when for the first time the window of the cell is opened, somebody points out to him the solar rays entering the room in streaks through the window holes, and says—"This the sun"; meaning thereby "these rays are a partial aspect of the sun, and knowing these if you are inquisitive the sun itself as a luminous substance consisting of such endless rays will be known to you". Similarly, to the Jiva that has from beginningless time been enveloped in deep abysmal darkness of ignorance, the Śruti as a spiritual guide instructs in the

shape of the text 'Oh Jiva, how miserable is thy lot! Forgetting your true function of devotion to Bhagavān and thereby incurring a serious transgression you have been confined, as a sort of penalty, to this hellish prison-cell of a corporeal frame by the Māyā Śakti of Bhagavān, and thereby you are suffering such endless miseries of diverse kinds. Know it for certain that this wrong identity with the transient gross elements is not your intrinsic real nature; you are that Love God Kṛṣṇa in so far as your intrinsic selfhood, being but a bit of the Infinite Supersensuous Bliss and Knowledge of Kṛṣṇa, bears a resemblance to him. Knowing this your real self, if you are inquisitive and devote yourself wholeheartedly to your natural function of devotion, if you depend solely upon the grace of Bhagavān, your realisation in the shape of attainment of Premānanda the highest—bonum will sooner or later come to pass as a matter of course; that Selfluminous Self-existent Supersensuous Being or Substance, of whose endless attributes you are but a part, will reveal Himself to you in no time".

CHAPTER VII

✓ The Problem of Creation.

Vivartavāda and Parīṇāmavāda :

The theory of Nescience being untenable, the doctrine of Vivarta which follows as a corollary from this theory and which according to this view is the underlying principle of creation cannot be upheld and must be replaced by the doctrine of Parīṇāma. By Vivarta or illusory generation is meant the production of an effect which has an existence different in kind from that of its material i. e. illusory-material cause, while by Parīṇāma or evolution is meant the pro-

duction of an effect which has the same kind of existence as its material cause.¹ As to the illusory-material cause of the world it is stated that the followers of Śāṅkara differing a little from older Vedāntists regard Brahman not as the material cause but as the illusory material cause of the world. And since the character of reality attaches to the kind of existence of Brahman, by the Vivarta Vāda the world which is the product of creation would be regarded as unreal in character, while the Parīṇāma Vāda would make the world a reality. In other words, the falsity of the world cannot be maintained, and its reality must be upheld. This reality however is to be understood not in the sense of the Absolute reality of Bhagavān but in the sense that the world is relatively real. The world is real subject to the condition of the reality of Bhagavān whose body or part the world is. There is thus sameness between Bhagavān and the world, reality being attached to both. Yet there is difference, because, while Bhagavān is eternal, the world is noneternal and perishable. Indeed the world may be regarded as eternal and non-decaying in-as-much as even after dissolution the world exists in a subtle state in the Supreme Source Bhagavān, but so far as the gross state of the world is concerned, so far as the world is in the state of being presentable to our gross senses, it is regarded as non-eternal and perishable. If again, by way of twisting the meaning of words, some body regards the character of non-eternity and perishableness as a synonym for falsity, we should say in reply that the falsity which is thus ascribed is not the same as the falsity following from the Nescience-theory. In other words, such falsity is not the same as that of a snake for rope or of a silver for nacre. In the latter cases the snake or silver has its existence solely confined to wrong apprehension and not consisting in the production of a tangible effect. The alleged effect of terrorising

1. Cf. विवर्त्तो नाम उपादानविषमसत्ताककार्योपपत्तिः, परिणामो नाम उपादानसमसत्ताककार्योपपत्तिः । Vedānta-paribhāṣa, p. 11.

and the like is not present in case the error is detected. So long as the rope appears as a snake there might be fear in the seer's mind, but the fear is gone as soon as the wrong notion is removed. In the case of the world, on the other hand, be it misapprehended or not, it always by means of its intrinsic nature produces some tangible effect, e. g., from the point of view of its relation of sameness to Bhagavān, it concentrates the individual's mind to this aspect alone thereby arousing a thought of Bhagavān, and from the point of its noneternity etc. it diverts the mind away from such a fleeting being.

By the *Parīṣāma Vāda*, therefore, we are led not to the falsity but to the relative or conditional reality of the world, which reality consists in the noneternity and perishableness of the world. This noneternity and perishableness is not to be objected to on the ground of the Śruti text अमृतममृता अभूम अक्षयं ह वै चातुर्मास्ययाजिनः सुकृतं भवति । (Atharvaśīras, 3). Indeed owing to the words अमृता and अक्षय (non-decaying) the apparent meaning of the Śruti is as if the sacrificial rites etc are non-decaying and so the world is eternal. But it is to be remembered that the Vedic texts are classified into three kinds, viz, that some are injunctions (*Vidhis*), some are laudatory verses (*Arthavāda*), while others are *Mantras*. The laudatory verses, which simply state an applause of the thing or rite referred to in the injunctory verses, are clearly connected with the injunctions, each injunction having its own laudatory verse or verses (cf. विधिना त्वेकवाक्यत्वात् स्तुत्यर्थेन विधीनां स्युः-जैमिनिः). Thus the text cited here is to be regarded as a laudatory verse and to be read along with a *Vidhi* stated previously. There is an injunction that sacrificial rites are to be performed, for otherwise the mind would not be reduced to that preparatory

stage in which an inquisitiveness into Brahman (ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा) arises; and to make the mind of individuals more and more inclined towards such ceremonial observances, the observances are praised in the अर्थवाद verses. By implication, the effects of the rites referred to in the verse, therefore, are to be understood not in the sense of eternal but in the sense of perishable; and this true significance of the verse must be upheld in order that there should be consistency with various other texts e. g. "तद् यथेह कर्मजितो लोकः क्षीयते एवमवामूत्र पुण्यजितो लोकः क्षीयते इति", which means 'As the world acquired by (the effects of) bad acts is perishable, so is perishable the world acquired by good acts'. If it is urged against this Pariṇāma Vāda—why is it that the world, which is the effect of the Māyā Śakti of the Eternal Self-existent Being Bhagavān, is perishable and noneternal?—why is here a violation of the Vaiśeṣika aphorism "कारणगुणाः कार्यगुणमारभन्ते"? Our reply is that such difference in character between the effect and its cause is due to the supreme inconceivable power of Bhagavān whose absoluteness is posited the more by inconsistencies brought forth and conquered, by differences effected and vanquished. Besides, such difference in character between the cause and effect is also to be met with in the world itself in-as-much as the lustre produced as an effect of fire as the cause has not the power of burning which is possessed by the fire.

The reality of the world which is thus established may also be supported by various other texts. Thus Viṣṇu Bhikṣu in his Sāṃkhyapravachana bhāṣya p. 225 says—
जगत्सत्यत्वमदुष्टकारणजन्यत्वात् बाधकाभावात् । निद्रादिदोष-
दुष्टान्तःकरणादिजन्यत्वेन स्वाप्नविषयशङ्खपीतिमादीनामसत्यत्वं
लोके दृष्टं तच्च महदादिप्रपञ्चे नास्ति तत्कारणस्य प्रकृतेर्हिण्यगर्भ-

बुद्धेश्चादुष्टत्वात् ॥ "The world is true since its origination is from a cause that has no defect and since there is nothing to make out the world to be false. The object of a dream, the imagined yellowness of a white conchshell etc, are found among men to be untrue by reason that they owe their origin to the internal organ etc. infected by the defects of sleep etc. This untruthness does not belong to the universe made up of the great intellect and the like, for the causes of that universe are free from all defects". The same fact of world-reality is also indicated by the word **याथातथ्यत्**.¹ used in the *Īśāvāsyaopaniṣad* Text—**स पर्यगच्छुक्कमकायमवगुणमन्नाविं शुभमपापचिद्धम् । कविर्मनीषी परिभूः स्वयम्भूर्याथातथ्यतोऽर्थान् व्यदधाच्छाश्वतीभ्यः सनाभ्यः ॥**—"He, the wise and high-souled One, the overthrower (of all prowess) and Self-existent, entered the formless, markless and pure semen unaffected with any transgression, and for endless years effected things (attended with) reality". We might refer further to what Valadeva Vidyā-bhūṣṇa in his *Prameyaratnāvalī* (third *Prameya*) says, viz—**स्वशक्त्या सृष्टवान् विष्णुर्यथार्थं सर्वविजगत् । इत्युक्तेः सत्यमेवैनद् वैराग्यार्थमसद्वचः ॥**—which means this—'The Omniscient Being Viṣṇu by means of His own potency created the world as a reality; nor is this fact of the world's reality to be regarded as contradictory to the unreality expressed in the text—**तस्मादिदं जगदशेषम् असत्स्वरूपम्** etc, for the world though real is always a transient thing and hence the duty of a Jīva is to divert the

1. The word **याथातथ्यत्** in the text is to be taken in connection with the word **अर्थान्**—objects; and because the word **याथातथ्य** means nothing but reality, the only unambiguous meaning of the last line in the text is that the Omniscient Self-existent Being created objects (of the universe) that are real.

mind away from this world, and with a view to lay a special stress upon the transient character of the world some of the scriptural texts describe it as if it were unreal, whereas the true significance of all the texts is that the world is real."

Besides, with whatever subtlety and evasiveness he might try establish the curious theory of Illusion, Śaṅkara himself, a great devotee to Viṣṇu as he was, indirectly admits some sort of reality of the world when he ascribes in his sūtra=bhāṣya a practical existence to the world. Now the notion of practical existence as entertained by Śaṅkara may be summarily regarded as a combination of two contradictory ideas, viz those of existence and non-existence; and the contradiction can be explained away only if the world and all practical things which they endeavour to prove to be nothing whatsoever be regarded as something i. e. having a certain real existence. This point will be made evident if we critically examine the meaning of Māyā as **सदसद्भ्यामनिर्वाच्य**. On the basis of the meaning of Māyā the character of the world is thus described—"That which ever presents itself as the horn of a hare is regarded as unreal, and that which presents itself and is never falsified as the true nature of spirit is held for true; but as regards the universe, we can not say that it is unreal since it is established by perception and other proofs to exist, nor can we say that it is real, since it is falsified by Right Apprehension. 'The universe therefore is to be described as neither true nor unreal'. In reply it might be said that the argument herein contained is simply hollow. To be other than true is to be unreal. If then the universe be not true, manifestly it is nothing but unreal. On the other hand, if not unreal, it follows that it is true. For the denial of either of these—trueness and unreality—implies the affirmation of the other, and no other alternative

is possible. Moreover, the view thus propounded being at war with ordinary consciousness is impossible of establishment; for that which presents itself and is falsified e. g. the mirage, or a snake surmised in a rope, is positively unreal; and in the estimation of mankind generally there is no difference between such a thing as the horn of a hare and the mirage. Hence if the universe be falsified by Right Apprehension, it is simply unreal and so is not incapable of being described as 'neither real nor unreal'. The unreality of the world which is thus arrived at is to be understood in the sense of non-eternity and perishableness, and hence there is no conflict with the view which we have established, viz that the world is real and at the same time perishable and non-eternal.

World a Reality: From the above it appears that according to the true theory and natural interpretation of the Vedānta the world is not to be regarded as false but a reality. And so the Scriptures say—सदेव सौम्य इदमग्र आसीत् (Chhā. VI, 2, 1) आत्मा वा इदमग्र आसीत् (Ait I, 1)—“In the beginning it was existent (Real)”, “In the beginning there was the Self”. The clear meaning of the texts however is that in the beginning i. e. after each great dissolution (Mahāpralaya) the Highest Self Bhagavān alone exists containing within Himself the real world as a force. There is also the text असदेव इदमग्र आसीत् (Chhā. III, 19, 1). “Non-existent it was in the beginning”. To reconcile these two apparently contradictory statements we must not take the words सत् and असत् in the strict literal senses. To explain further—In the case of a jar, just before its production by means of certain processes applied to a lump of clay, we can not say that it is literally existent, for in that case the processes for

production would be regarded useless; nor can it be said to be absolutely non-existent like an *Ākāśakusuma*, for in that case no kind of process applied by any expert hand would be able to produce it out of nothing. The true view therefore is that before production the jar exists in a subtle state of reality in the shape of a lump of clay, and the same subtle jar is made presentable to the sense after the processes applied to the clay. Similarly, the only reality in the absolute sense is Bhagavān who by means of the *Māyā Śakti*, manifested directly by His partial aspect *Paramātinā*, causes the creation, sustentation and dissolution of the universe; such creation and dissolution go on eternally in a cycle, each creation being followed by dissolution which again is followed by creation, and so on. Of the four kinds of dissolution the great one or the *Mahāpralaya* is that in which there exists Bhagavān alone, and everything else—the world included—lies in a subtle state in the supreme source Bhagavān; the world now exists as a force and not in the shape of manifold objects presentable to the gross sense. This subtle state of the world is what is truly signified by the word *असत्* in the above text: and yet it is not meant that the world in this state is an unreal or false thing as the rival theorists maintain but a reality in as much as it is related as a part to the Absolute Reality Bhagavān.

The reality which thus attaches to the world is however to be understood in a sense quite different from that adopted by the empirical or materialistic thinkers of the west. No doubt with them the external world is a reality and as such is quite a good exchange for the futile other world—for the mirages and the chimeras of the abstract understanding. But the great defect of their theory lies in the fact that they make sense = perception the form in which fact is to be apprehended. They themselves admit that sense = perception as such is always

individual, always transient; and with whatever effort they might try to show that a sum total of such individual transient percepts constitutes the reality of the world they are completely blind of the fact that no amount of such totalising will be able to make the world a reality unless it is clearly shown that one Infinite Principle underlies these sense perceptions so as to connect them together as so many units coming under a complete whole. While abstracting the world away from the sphere of abstract understanding they stretch their blind scepticism to such an abnormal degree that they inevitably fall into the error of another abstraction and thereby the universal principle of the understanding entirely disappears from the arena of philosophical thought and their theory becomes completely one-sided. In India also the Charvākists committed a similar blunder. If we look again to the subjective Idealism of Berkeley and others it would appear that their theory of the world also is but a partial exposition of the true theory that was lately developed in the west. According to the view of this defective Idealism objects of the world are only ideas, they having no existence in themselves and apart from perception. They do not hold however that the things which we see, touch etc are false, their meaning is that they are forms of perception. The perception of them constitutes their essence—*percipii essendi*. To this subjective Idealism an exception might be taken and that not unreasonably. It reduces the facts of consciousness to a personal world created by ourselves alone. When it states that the only real existence of the world is constituted by the individual mind alone it clearly forgets the fact that the mind itself being a product included in the world cannot plausibly serve as the authority to establish the existential reality of the world. The true statement of the case we may make as

follows in the words of the Hegelian philosopher Mr. Wallace—
 “The things of which we have direct consciousness are mere phenomena not for us only, but in their own nature; and the true and proper case of these things, finite as they are, is to have their existence founded not in themselves but in the universal divine Idea. This view of things, it is true, is as idealistic as Kant’s, but in contradistinction to the subjective idealism of the critical philosophy it should be termed absolute idealism. Absolute Idealism, however, though it is far in advance of vulgar realism, is by no means merely restricted to philosophy. It lies at the root of all religion, for religion too believes the actual world we see, the sum total of existence, to be erected and governed by God” (Wallace’s *Logic of Hegel*, 2nd Ed. p. 93-94).

By referring to the Absolute Idealism so as to admit its view as the true view of the world, I do not mean to say that this idealistic theory of the west agrees in all respects with the theory of Vaiṣṇava Philosophy. What I mean is that of all the philosophical theories of the west this alone seems to bear a good deal of resemblance to the philosophy of Vaiṣṇava Religion so far as the point of world’s reality is concerned. Nor let it be understood by any body that in the Śruti texts like **तनमनोऽसृजत मनः प्रजापतिम्** the subjective idealist’s theory is involved; for the word **मन** in the text does not mean individual mind but refers to Aniruddha, one of the Vyūhas of Kṛṣṇa, who is regarded as the divinity of the sum-total of all minds, similar to what Hegel describes as the Absolute Mind. Had the world been regarded as the product of the individual mind had it been the fact that the existence of the world consists in perception alone, the Śruti text **तदैक्षत बहु स्याम् प्रजायेय** (chhā. VI, 2, 3) “It (Brahman) thought may I be many, may I create, would have no meaning.

The world's reality, which is thus established by lots of evidence, and which consists in the world's being a part or body of Brahman may also be indirectly shown by the fact that to create an illusory world is simply beyond the conception of a Being like Bhagavān whose essence is Truth or Reality and whose potencies are inconceivable. This very fact is also clearly stated in the Śruti text cited in the Mādhyama-Bhāṣya, viz अथैनमाहुः सत्यकर्मति सत्यं ह्येवेदं विश्वमसृजत इति which means that the Absolute Being is called On· having true acts in-as-much as He created this true universe. The same idea is echoed in the Bhāgavata text—सत्यत्रयं सत्यपरं त्रि-सत्यं सत्यस्य योनिं निहितञ्च सत्ये · सत्यस्य सत्यमृतसत्यनेत्रं सत्यात्मकं त्वां शरणं प्रपन्नाः ॥ (X, 2, 26) where it is emphatically asserted that truth or reality attaches not only to the intrinsic nature of Bhagavān but also to His act which includes creation, sustentation and dissolution of the universe, save that in the one case the reality is Absolute while in the other it is relative.

The reality of the world must be admitted for another reason more, viz: that its admission in the restricted sense indicated above affords a most satisfactory and reasonable explanation of the world itself. Śāṅkara's theory of pure monism being exploded, if we look to the similar monistic theories of the west, e.g. to the Parmenidian theory of Being in the Greek Philosophy, to the Spinozistic theory of substance in the modern, it would appear that these systems in the explanation of the universe either prove a failure of inconsistency, or to save their own critical position take to an artifice which overthrows their own theory. "Monism, therefore, which can stand its ground and serve for an explanation of the universe, must not exclude Dualism. All indeed is one life, one being, on· thought; but a life, a being, a thought which only exists as it opposes itself within itself, sets itself apart from itself,

projects its meaning and relations outwards and upwards, and yet retains and carries out the power of reuniting itself. The Absolute may be called one, but it is also the All; it is a One which makes and overcomes difference; It is, and It essentially is, in the antithesis of Nature and Spirit, Object and Subject, matter and mind; but under and over the antithesis it is fundamental and completed Unity. Monism literally understood is absurd, for it ignores what cannot be ignored—the many; and Dualism, which is offered sometimes as a competitive scheme, is not much better, unless we understand the Dualism to be no fixed bisection, but an ever-appearing and ever-superseded antithesis, which is the witness to the power and the freedom of the One—which is not alone but One and All, One in All, and All in One" (Wallace's Logic of Hegel P. 148).

The Hegelian theory, thus concisely stated in the three choice expressions 'One and All', 'One in All', and 'All in One', implies that (a) both the Absolute Idea and the world are real; (b) the Absolute Idea eternally realises Itself concretely in the eternal creative process, and in this sense the Absolute is to be regarded as the Completed and Concrete Reality, in other words, the true absolute character of the Absolute is constituted only by the eternal creative process; (c) the reality of the world is to be considered only in its relation to the Reality of the Absolute Idea which according to Hegel is the starting point in thought, in other words, the world is real not by itself but because it is the manifestation of the Absolute Idea. We have already shown how Hegel's theory is subjected to severe criticism so far as the point (c) is concerned, and as such the view stated herein finds no place in the system of Vaiṣṇavism which recognises not 'eternal creative processes' but an eternal cycle in which both creation and dissolution alternately go on in a systematic order. Regarding the other

points, however, there seems to be an agreement between the theory of Hegel and that of Vaisnavism. And because the philosophy of Hegel, being regarded as the latest and greatest development of thought, offers a most satisfactory explanation of the world, we are fully justified in asserting that the admission of the world's reality in the system of Vaisnavism affords a most satisfactory and rational interpretation of the world itself.

The Philosophy of Creation:—

The world's reality being thus conclusively proved, the next question arises 'why do creative processes proceed at all?' To enter a little more deep into the point and to state the problem in full we should bring to our mind what a class of thinkers in the west says about creation. Thus we find that against the ordinary dualistic conception of God it has been urged by Spinoza and others that "if God be the external cause or contriver of the world, the act of creation must be purposive and a purpose of this sort which cannot find satisfaction within the range of the preexistent implies want or imperfection. Why did God create the world? What is the reason that the Absolute unity should go beyond itself to manifest or reveal itself in the manifoldness of finite existence? Was he weary with His inactivity, or did He want to have something to please His eyes, that He was led to contrive the world?" A similar objection might press equally against the theory of the Vedānta as contained in the Bhāgavata Texts. And this has been noticed by the author of the sūtras in the aphorism **न प्रयोजनवत्त्वात्**, and he attempts to refute it in the next aphorism **लोकवत्तु लीलाकैवल्यम्**.

All the commentators agree about the meaning of the former sūtra, and it may be thus stated in the language of Rāmānuja—"Although the Absolute Lord, who before creation is alone, is endowed with all kinds of powers in the highest

degree, and hence is by Himself capable of creating the world, still we cannot ascribe to Him actual causality with regard to the world, for this manifold world displays the nature of a thing depending on a motive and the Lord has no motive to urge Him to creation. In the case of all those who enter on some activity after having formed an idea of the effect to be accomplished, there exists a motive in the form of something beneficial either to themselves or to others. Now Brahman to whose essential nature it belongs that all His wishes are eternally fulfilled does not attain through creation any object not attained before. Nor again is the second alternative possible, for a Being all whose wishes are fulfilled could concern Itself about others only with a view to benefiting them. No merciful divinity would create a world so full, as ours is, of evils of all kinds—birth, old age, death, hell and so on; if it created at all, pity would move it to create a world altogether happy. Brahman thus having no possible motive cannot be the cause of the world. This *prima facie* view is disposed of in the next sūtra:—"But it is mere sport, as in ordinary life." To explain further, we might say in the language of the Govinda Bhāṣya that the motive which prompts the Absolute Being—all whose wishes are fulfilled and who is perfect in himself—to the creation of this wonderful world is not the attainment of any object to Himself or others, but simply sport, play. We see in ordinary life how when a man is in ecstatic joy, the joy tends to overflow itself—to stream forth, and ultimately produces some sort of act in the shape of merry sportive dance and song independent of any motive of attaining any object whatsoever. To take a concrete example—Hiero, King of Syracuse, it is said, once set the great scientist Archimedes to discover whether or not the gold which he had given to an artist to work into a crown for him had been mixed

with baser metal. Archimades was puzzled till one day as he was stepping into a bath and observed the water running over, it occurred to him that the excess of bulk, occasioned by the introduction of alloy, could be measured by putting the crown and an equal weight of gold separately into a vessel filled with water and observing the difference of overflow. He was so overjoyed at this happy thought having struck him that he ran home without his clothes, dancing and shouting —“I have found it, I have found it”. Just as such an act of shouting and dancing proceeds simply from the excessive joy, irrespectively of any motive of attaining any object, so the act of creation proceeds spontaneously as a sport, irrespectively of any motive, simply from the Eternal Bliss constituting the very essence of the Lord. Again, just as the dance or song continuing for some time stops, so the sportive act of God continuing for sometime comes to a standstill and that state is called Dissolution.

The explanation thus given of the Absolute Lord being the cause of creation etc of the world is a faultless one, and finds support from the Māṇḍukya Śruti.¹—देवस्यैव स्वभावोऽयमाप्तकामस्य का स्पृहा, ‘The creative emanation is but the nature of the Lord, how can there be any desire of Him who is all sufficient?’ It further disposes of Spinoza’s unnecessary objection against the dualistic conception of God, as well as of the theory of creation out of nothing—a theory which in the language of Principal Caird completely subverts religion, our belief in scriptures and the hopes and fears which religion inculcates.

-
1. This text has been cited by Valadeva Vidyabhusana in his Govinda Bhasya as occurring in the Mandukya Sṛuti, but so far as the current Editions of Upanisads go, it occurs neither in the Mandukya nor in the Mundaka Sṛuti. It can be traced however to ‘Gaudapada’s Karikas’.

The philosophy of creation dealt with above centres round one point, viz, that creation proceeds spontaneously from the bliss potency of Bhagavān. This fact is explicitly stated in the Taitt. text को ह्येवान्यात् कः प्राण्यात् यदेष आकाश आनन्दो न स्यात् a detailed explanation of which was already given. There is no doubt that such explanation of the riddle of creation is a most satisfactory one inasmuch as it is a distinct triumph over the defective theories we find in the philosophic thought of the East and West. The implication of this theory, again, is that God is beyond all limitation in the matter of creation—that in creating He is actuated by nothing but His own freedom of exuberant joy. But in the same Upanisad the above text is preceded by another, viz, स तपोऽतप्यत, स तपस्तप्त्वा इदं सर्वमसृजन, which means that God made penance and creation proceeded from the heat generated thereby. The text evidently implies that for the purpose of creation God subjects Himself to a limitation or restriction. Here comes a contradiction indeed with the above fact of God's freedom in the matter of creation. But it is to be remembered that the Absolute is that wherein all contradictions are effected and vanquished—are reconciled in a harmonious way. Moreover, the text स तपोऽतप्यत etc. implies further that, since heat is a kind of motion and motion is action, it is the intention of God that all His created beings should always act and never remain inactive. The best solution of the veritable puzzle of creation, therefore, is to be found in the combined implication of the two Taitt. texts cited above.

It is useless for the purpose of the present treatise to give an account of the details of creation. It would suffice here to state what has already been stated, viz, that the world is created by the Upaniṣā aspect of the Māyā Śakti of Bha-

gavān which is differently styled as Pradhāna or Prakṛti or Avyakta. This Pradhāna by itself is an unintelligent substance—the eternal matter that appears in Platonic thought, but when creation in detail takes place from it by way of evolution, the consciousness or thought of the Absolute is transfused into it as we come to know from the Śruti text “तदेतच्चहुस्याम् प्रजायेय”. Creation, in other words, is not at all possible without the ईक्षण or conception in the Highest mind. Herein lies an agreement with the Biblical theory of creation inas-much as there is a tacit reference to the creative conception of God just before actual creation as laid down in the text—“Let there be light and there was light”.

As regards the Sāṃkhya System on this point, although there is much caviling at it from many quarters, we venture to assert as before that the Sāṃkhist does not deserve so much adverse criticism. Indeed there are many inconsistencies due mainly to want of clearness in expression, yet the system indirectly admits the fact ‘that creation never proceeds from the unintelligent substance Pradhāna considered as such, but from it only when there takes place a contiguity with the intelligent principle Puruṣa—only when the consciousness of the Puruṣa is reflected upon it’.

The world, which thus proceeds from the Upādāna Māyā Pradhāna, being itself unconscious in nature, does not constitute creation in the fullest sense of the term. It might be the world proper, but the world as we see—the concrete world so to say—is made up of both conscious and unconscious substances. Spirit and matter, subject and object, soul and body—these two classes of things constitute creation as concretely manifest to us. The conscious part of the creation is supplied by the Nimitta Māyā as we have already said. By the Vikṣepa function of the Nimitta Māyā the Jīvas that

have their natural function suspended are thrown off into a severe bondage by way of being encased in different corporeal frames that are brought to existence by the Upādāna Māyā Pradhāna. There is an endless diversity in the nature of these corporeal frames—man, deity quadruped, bird and the like; and the peculiar habitation of a Jīva in one or the other of the diverse organic bodies is guided by the nature of the act done by the Jīva in the past or present existences. This leads us to the doctrine of Karman which was already explained in detail. The manifold objects of the world, again, are signified by different names, and this nomenclature and terminology is supplied by that potency or attribute of the Absolute Being which is called here Śabda Brahman or Eternal Word. The Śabdabrahman is nothing but the eternal Vedas taken as a whole, and the respective worldly habitations of Jīvas are determined therefore not only by the nature of the acts done but also by way of reference to the Vedic texts. This theory of eternity of words in its bearing upon the problem of creation is not only established in Hindu Philosophy but also in the west. Thus an important analogue to this theory we may find in the theory of Logos. The Logos theory appeared in different shapes from the time of the hylozoistic philosophers of ancient Greece. It was developed by one Philo. With Philo God is absolute incorporeal perfection apprehensible only by reason. An intermediate agent however is affirmed, and this is the Logos. The Logos is described as God's elder son, as the world is His younger. It resides with God as His wisdom, and is in the world as the divine reason. It is God's instrument in creation and revelation, having the twofold functions of Reason and Word.¹

1. The doctrine of Logos as word also belongs to the Hebrew

Reality of the world in its bearing upon Religion:—

The fact of the world's reality is likely to arouse certain misconceptions as regards the nature of true religion. Some might think, for instance, that religion consists in an individual's concentration of thought towards worldly objects alone; others again going to the other extreme might regard the world and worldly men as quite unfit for religious speculation of any kind. Neither of these contains the whole truth. Since religion in the true sense of the term consists in seeking after absolute Truth, and since again the reality attached to the world is only a relative one, the highest duty of mankind can never be sole undivided attention to things of the world which individually considered are non-eternal and transient. Nor can it be maintained that realisation in any shape can never be expected of an individual living in the midst of worldly environments. The true view on this point we may gather from the Bhāg. text—
**सदिव मनस्त्रिवृत्त्वयि निभान्यसदामनुजात् सदभिमुखस्त्यशेषमिद-
 मान्तयात्मविदः । नहि विकृतिं त्यजन्ति (?) कनकस्य तदाम्तया
 स्वकृतमनुप्रविष्टमिदमान्तयावासितम् ॥ (X. 87, 26).**

Thought. Thus we find, God in the Old Testament is exhibited as speaking and by His word communicating His will. The word of the God of Revelation is represented as the creative principle (Gen: i 3, Psalm XXXIII, 6), as the executor of divine judgments (Hosea VI, 5).

In connection with this word theory one thing is to be distinctly remembered, viz. that words are not names of individuals but always of classes or genera, and as genera they are eternal. These Logoi or concepts (Begriff) exist before creation, may, render the creation possible. This idea occurs in the much-despised Neo-Platonic philosophy which is the basis of the Christian theory of creation as stated above. It also occurs in the Vedic Texts. Thus, as we find in the Taitt. Br. II, 2, 4, 2— 'This is the earth', He said, and created the earth," so also in the O. T. thought which is so full of Neoplatonic reminiscences we find 'God spake. Let there be light, and there was light'.

The meaning is this:—"In the preparation of a sloop the ladle used for the purpose is often times immersed in the pot containing the sloop-materials, yet the juice does not stick to the ladle. Similarly Bhagavān as the Immanent Regulator is eternally present within the heart of all beings of the universe, yet the mind of the being averse to Bhagavān, although in constant contiguity with the allpervading Being, gets no attachment to Him. Again, just as a gold-merchant dealing in gold only is attracted to wherever he might find gold articles, and purchases all such articles, being unmindful of their shape, good or bad; so also an individual with his sole hankering after a knowledge of and devotion to the Absolute Being looks only to the reality-aspect of the world which lies overspread as a body of the Absolute, and thus gets no attachment to the perishable manifold objects of the world". Thus it appears that the significance of the world's reality from the religious point of view consists in the fact that, in the case of select fortunate beings, though not in the case of all, it appears as if it were shorn of its differences in transiency and possessed only of a reality in being a part of the all=pervading Being. These individual beings, therefore, though living in the midst of worldly transient environments, are not at all affected by the latter, and see the totality of the world as pervaded by the Immanent Regulator and thereby realise the Paramātmā Purusa everywhere. Such realisation of Paramātmā Purusa, though not an end in itself according to the cult of Ahoituki-Bhakti, is yet a stepping stone to the attainment of the highest Summumbonum. And because such partial realisation of Bhagavān is indeed possible for one living in the world, it can never be said that the world's reality has no place in the sphere of Vaiṣṇava Religion.

CHAPTER VII.

The Cult of Gourāṅga.

Nothing can be more incomplete than to write an introduction to the philosophy of Vaiṣṇava Religion without giving a clear exposition of the concept of Śrī Gourāṅga, which is the most essential factor in Bengal Vaiṣṇavism. Before dealing with this important topic it is indeed necessary and desirable to trace out a satisfactory historical background. But such a task seems hardly possible under the present circumstances, there being no systematic historical accounts of this nature at our disposal. As far as can be gathered from the very scanty materials scattered here and there, it might be said that in and before the fifteenth century A. D. the city of Navadvīpa (Nadia), the then capital of Bengal, was not only regarded as the most important and flourishing city in that province, but could stand comparison with any other important city in the other provinces of India. The importance was not because of its being a place of business—not so much because of its being the capital city, but because of its being a great centre of learning. Teachers were then regarded as the heads of societies. Love of learning was very great, specially amongst the people belonging to the higher castes. Every one—young or old, male or female—was greatly devoted to learning, nay, knew of no other business than to spend the whole time in the midst of books. In a word, the state of Navadvīpa at the time was a unique one in the whole history of the world. In different places of the world, a rise in importance and fame takes place in different ways—some being led by a passion for war, some by the discovery of new means for the acquisition of wealth, some again by religious fanaticism, while others by a political fight. Rarely we come across such a passion for learning

leading to great fame and importance, as was then prevalent in the city of Navadvīpa. Of the different branches of learning, however, the system of Nyāya began to be studied the most. As a consequence thereof all the revelling in lores became tainted with one great defect, viz, that the underlying motive in almost all cases was to make off a great show of learning. Scholars thus turned out to be so many pedagogues, and love of learning degenerated into a gross vanity and self-conceit. As is quite natural, with the greater and greater inclination of the people's mind towards such scholastic study attended with too much pndantry, it deviated away from religious observances and hence from a desire for permanent bliss. Already there had appeared a tendency to the abuse of true religion; for there are evidences to show that the people of Navadvīpa—literate as well as illiterate—had begun to worship Hari as Satya Nārāyaṇa and Chāṇḍī as Maṅgala Chāṇḍī, and such transition in the religious method means nothing but a change of religion into a sort of mammon-worship. Briefly it might be said that there was observable throughout a sad want of sincerity and earnest devotion in religious rites: and what the scriptures describe as a remote means was wrongly accepted as an end in itself. Besides, there was always to be found a conflict between parties, communities and individuals; and a severe enemical relation prevailed between Hindus and Musalmans. Each tried his best to surpass others not by means of a right earnestness in devotional worship and religious speculation, but by means of a spirit of competition in matters terrestrial. The state of religion at the time was thus reduced to a complete chaos.

At such a critical juncture appeared Lord Gourāṅga with His adherents and followers, as a saviour of mankind the like of which the world had never seen before. Soon the graceful charm of His magnetic influence spread far and wide, and

created that genial and tranquil state of the mind which had so long remained suspended within the rational principle in mankind. All pedantry, all strifes, all jealousy, all hypocrisy, all vanity came to an end, yielding place to an unspeakable state of sweet harmony; and an unprecedented universal brotherhood gained ground for the first time in the annals of the history of mankind. His preachings of the resplendent truths of religion, His self-practice as a devotee of the first rank, acted a spell upon the minds of mankind—nay, upon all created beings. None escaped the genial influence of His super-sensative magnetism: wished or not, all were alike embraced by Him, all were bound down to him in the closest tie of divine love, all were equally favoured with that supersensuous beatific joy which it is that He manifested Himself to the helpless miserable beings to part with. Even the most obdurate, the most sinful, the greatest drunkards, those that were then regarded as the pest of the society, those that were looked down with the greatest contempt, those that were so deeply immersed in the ocean of untold miseries as to have wrought out a complete self-effacement, so to say,—all had their nature completely changed even by the slightest touch of His all-surpassing graceful influence of pure bliss.

Lord Gourāṅga came down from the supersensuous highest heaven with the object—strictly speaking with the one amongst many objects—of revealing to the miserable beings of the earth the eternal cult of Bhakti that had been lying for centuries in a state of dormancy and inaction. His mission was fulfilled through the instrumentality of His own constant associates. The Sacred texts of the Bhāgavata, the Gītā, the Vedānta system and other scriptures were explained in much elaboration and in a method quite unprecedented, so that the main principles and processes of devotional worship of the Absolute Being Bhagavān

were charmingly exposed in a most befitting manner. The easiest methods of loud chantings of Vedic hymns and citations of the sweet names of Bhagavān were shown out in such a manner that religion even in its severity and high depth was not at all repelling to any body; on the other hand, all hearts, so long dried up with the scorching rays of empty abstractions and vain delusions, became softened and melted with the showers of blissful joy and supersensuous emotion. The cult of Bhakti thus assumed a new shape in so far as it was practised by the people of Gouda (Bengal); and this cult of Bhakti goes by the name of Goudiya Vaisnava Dharma in which the principle of Gourāṅga and His teachings play the most prominent part.

The question now is 'what is Lord Gourāṅga?' Different answers are given by different classes of people, and these I am inclined to describe as popular misconceptions about the concept of Gourāṅga. (1) Historians describe Him as a great personality—an enthusiastic religious reformer who by sheer force of his own personality created a new epoch in the religious sphere of Bengal at the time, and whose teachings are still followed by the people not only of Bengal but of many other provinces of India and outside. They go further, and regarding him a human being of a very high order bring him under the same category as Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Kavira, Nānaka and many other religious reformers that flourished before and after him. (2) Literary savants, while a little loath to differ from the historian critics about the human personality of Gourāṅga and yet willing to go a little ahead, admit in an indirect way his divinity to a partial extent, and rest satisfied with the thought that his preachings and doings being given a linguistic expression by his followers have enriched the Bengali language to a very great extent. (3) There are many again—those, I mean, who, having a little faith in the

scriptures of the Hindus and the tenets laid down therein, do not take the trouble of going deep into the original texts, but with or against the dictates of their conscience like to be enriched in thought by the curious translations thereof—, who regard Gourānga as nothing but an Incarnation of the Absolute being whose character of course they do not care to know in full. (4) Others again, whose mental principle is made a curious emporium of thoughts of diverse kinds, sneer him, scoff at him, take a great delight in showering upon him all sorts of sardonicisms, and make a good deal of inelegant fun and amusement at the expense of this poor Gourānga. But alas! “men may come and men may go, but I go on for ever”. In the poet’s words—‘what is, is for a ‘that.’

Indeed in all matters opinions differ, none the less so in the matter of religion. And such difference of opinion about religion, specially in its sectarian aspect, is not confined to India alone, but characterises the speculative thought of the whole world. In Europe, for instance, what do we find in the case of Christianity? A good deal of difference of opinion about the personality of Christ has prevailed there since the beginning of the Christian era. The doctrine of Christ as a God-man was assailed in different ways by different classes of critics and thinkers. The Ebionites, the Nazarenes, the Alogi and many other sects denied the true divinity of Christ. The writings of Spinoza and of the English deists such as Herbert, Toland, Shaftesbury and Bolingbroke helped largely to weaken the orthodox faith in Christianity. The language of Fichte and Hegel practically sublimates to nothing the doctrine of Christ’s divinity. Strauss instead of endeavouring to eliminate the supernatural or to invest it in some sort with a natural appearance treated the Gospel narratives as myths from which it was hardly possible to understand the historic

personality of Christ. Renan entirely abandoned all faith in Christ's divinity, and while speaking of Him as one whom his death made divine, treated him from the point of view of an amiable rabbi who, beginning as an innocent enthusiast, developed into something hardly, if at all, removed from conscious imposture. But I ask with all deference—"Has any of these severe outbursts of adverse criticism affected in any way the true divine personality of Christ or the intrinsic nature of Christianity as one set of the devotional worship of the Absolute Being?" The answer is an unqualified 'no'. Jesus is still regarded throughout the world as an incarnation of the Absolute, and the principles of Christianity, if well directed and properly applied, are still contributing to the prevalence of universal brotherhood and world-peace. To entertain, and make a publicity of, wrong and queer conceptions regarding a matter purely religious do nothing but a ludicrous display of one's own vitiated mental calibre. To a jaundiced eye all colours appear as yellow. A quantity of Gulañcha=extract tastes sweet to a phlegmatic tongue. Yet it is not the fact that all colours are of one kind, viz, yellow; nor is it to be doubted about the intrinsic bitterness of Gulañcha. The intrinsic nature of the principle of Gourāṅga therefore remains quite unaffected and unaltered whatever adverse and inelegant criticisms might be showered upon it. Lord Gourāṅga is ever shining resplendent with the brightest halo of his own selfluminous glory. His teachings and moral precepts, His excellent religious instructions, the theologico-philosophical-didactic purport of His surpassingly graceful beatific sports, are spreading far and wide and rejuvenating the world-religion with a new life and vigour. In short, notwithstanding all the adverse criticisms, He is what He is, viz, that He is neither a human personality, nor even an incarnation, but the absolute Being Bhagavān Himself.

So at last we arrive at the true theory about Gourāṅga—the theory that is held by Vaiṣṇava philosophers of the Bengal school and admitted by those who care to know anything about Bengal Vaiṣṇavism. Gourāṅga here is regarded as the Absolute Being Bhagavān Himself; and because the concept of Bhagavān is the same as Advaya Jñāna Tattwa, Lord Gourāṅga is forsooth the Advaya Jñāna Tattwa. Our next attempt therefore is to show how Gourāṅga Tattwa is the Advaya Tattwa.

Gourāṅga as Advaya Jñāna Tattwa :—

On the authority of the Chaitāṁṭa text “न चैतन्यान् कृष्णात् जगति परतत्त्वं परमिह”, Śrī Chaitanya or Gourāṅga is regarded as the Absolute Being Himself. But, as we have seen, the Bhāg. texts corroborated by various other scriptural texts directly and emphatically assert that Kṛṣṇa is the Advaya Jñāna Tattwa. Here comes an anomaly indeed. The philosophy of Vaiṣṇava Religion is surely not such a crude thought that it would make its own position ridiculous and untenable by admitting two separate entities as the Absolute. The apparent anomaly therefore can be explained away only if we can show the identity between the two concepts of Kṛṣṇa and Gourāṅga. Thus we find it clearly stated in the Charitāṁṭa text, “Nanda-suta vali yāre Bhāgavate gāi | Śrī Kṛṣṇa avatīrṇa Chaitanya Gosāṁi ||”, that “the self-same Advaya Jñāna Tattwa which the Bhāg. texts describe as Kṛṣṇa, the nurtured child of Nanda and Yaśodā, manifests Himself in the same full aspect as Śrīchaitanya or Gourāṅga”. This theory is involved in the very name of Gourāṅga as Kṛṣṇa Chaitanya. It appears therefore that so far as the theory goes there is complete identity between Kṛṣṇa and Gourāṅga; the only difference is in respect of the nature of the beatific sports eternally manifested by this Absolute Being.¹

1. Strictly speaking, no line of absolute demarcation can be

To establish this identity between the two concepts on a sound and sure basis it is indeed necessary to go further into details. The concept of Bhagavān, as we have explained before, implies the inherence of endless auspicious attributes in the Highest Substance. Many of these attributes even in the same degree of infinity might indeed be present in the incarnate Beings, the partial aspect of Bhagavān; but some are present in Bhagavān alone and nowhere else. In other words, the two attributes, viz, (1) the eternally concrete potency for granting beatific joy not only to human and other higher beings but also to irrational creatures—even to plants and creepers, & (2) the charming gracefulness ever manifest in all the acts,—these two attributes seem to be the differentia whereby Bhagavān as such is distinguished from all others. Since, therefore, the insignia of Advaya Jñāna Tattva consists in these two main attributes, a complete identity between Kṛṣṇa and Kṛṣṇachaitanya will be firmly established if it is shown that these attributes are alike present in both. Thus from the Laghu Bhāgavatāmṛta text सन्त्यवनारा वद्वः पङ्कजनाभस्य सर्वतो भद्राः । कृष्णादन्यः कोचालनास्वपि प्रेमदो भवति ॥, we come to know that though the re endless are incarnations of Kṛṣṇa

drawn between Theory and Lila. For example, the Vaisnava theory of the Absolute is that It is Rasa and Bliss embodied, and whatever lila or sport It might manifest can be satisfactorily explained only because It is Rasa. Still the Absolute Rasa manifests lila differently according to the difference in the manifestation of the potency or potencies, e.g. the Lila of the Absolute in the fullest display of potencies is not the same as that of the Incarnates. Hence it is that for the purpose of clear understanding and accurate explanation an apparent distinction has been drawn in the Vaisnava System between Theory and Lila.

appearing at different periods for doing good to the universe, yet none else but Kṛṣṇa is capable of granting Premānanda even to plants. Indeed, as appears from the Rāmāyaṇa texts, during the Rāma incarnation of Kṛṣṇa even the trees and plants, greatly devoted to Rāma as they were, could not refrain from crying aloud and shedding tears of sorrow at the time of his departure for forest-exile, and from this it would appear that the Incarnate Being Rāma also possesses the potency for granting beatific spirits even to immovables. But it is to be remembered here that while Rāma can afford this divine joy only through His separation, Kṛṣṇa possesses the sole power of granting it at all times—even while the beings enjoy His happy association and contiguity. This latter fact is clearly stated in the Bhāg. text—**का स्वयङ्ग ते कल्पदायतवेणु गीतसम्प्रोहितार्यचरितान्न चलोन्निलोक्याम् । तैलोक्यसौभगमिदञ्च निरीक्ष्य रूपं यद् गोद्विजद्रुममृगाः पुलकान्यविभ्रन् ॥** (X, 29-40)

The last two lines of the verse mean that the blissful potency of Kṛṣṇa is so very great that even irrational beings like cows, birds etc., not possessing any reasoning power, the immovable beings like plants and trees, and the most timid creatures like deer cannot but be attracted by the sweet notes of His divine flute, nay, by the generation of beatific joy in them they also bristle with supreme delight. This very fact is also referred to in another text of the Bhāg—**प्रणतभारविटपा मधुवाराः प्रेमद्व प्रतनवे ववृषुः स्म** (X, 35, 5) which means that trees bending low with excessive delight showered streams of sweet charm unto Him ever bristling and thrilling with beatific joy towards His own devotees.

This fact of irrational beings and immovables bristling with supersensuous love and emotional joy towards the Absolute Being might appear strange and rather ludicrous to

many here and abroad. To them our humble assertion is—The fact is admitted in a way by Scientists. A class of Psychologists like Pierre, Huber, Romanes, Sir John Lubbock and others, by carrying on investigating researches, arrived long ago at the conclusion that many of the processes of consciousness developed in the human mind are present also in lower animals. It further appears that "Animals can express emotion; the more highly developed of them can to a limited extent give evidence of the connection of ideas with their emotions. But the expressive movements of animals never show that regular articulation, that reflection in organic structure of the nature of intellectual ideation, which is characteristic of language proper" (Lectures on Human and Animal Psychology-Wundt, P. 362-363). Again the fact that even immovable beings like plants possess consciousness and can feel pleasure and pain was long ago realised by Hindu sages (cf. अन्तःसंज्ञा भवन्त्येते सुखदुःख समन्विताः Manu Chap. 1), and is recently being conclusively proved by means of experimentation by the Indian scientist Dr. J. C. Bose of world-wide renown. These emotional products in the minds of animals and plants are no doubt indistinct in character; but such indistinctness is to be accounted for not only by the less developed organism of their body but also by the generating causes thereof which all come within the sphere of worldly things. The emotional states of joy referred to in the Bhag. texts above are similar in nature to those in human beings and such that no amount of ideational processes caused by stimuli in the shape of worldly things can ever produce them either in human beings or in animals and plants. If the all surpassing potency of Bhagavān be admitted, there is no reason to believe this fact in the case of human beings and disbelieve in the case of animals and plants, the more in view of the fact that so far as such mental phenomena

caused by worldly stimuli are concerned there is some sort of similarity between the class of human beings and that of others.

It is clearly shown, therefore, how Kṛṣṇa is regarded as Advaya Jñāna Tattwa by reason of the one potency for granting beatific joy even to animals and plants. If now we look to the Līlā of Gourāṅga, we find the same attribute, perhaps a little more clearly manifested. We have already stated, and there are lots of texts in the Chari-āmṛta to show, how the slightest touch of the magnetic influence of the blissful nature of Gourāṅga equally favoured all with the highest treasure-trove of beatific joy. Far be it said of the sensible and educated people of all caste, creed or social status, even the most barbarous beastlike aboriginal tribes and many a non-Hindu e. g. Musalmanas, and those that were ever in the habit of caviling at the Vedas, were magnetised, as it were, by the sweet power of the blissful nature of Gourāṅga, and all on a sudden dived deep into the illimitable ocean of supreme joy flowing in torrents from the very contact and influence of that unparalleled saviour of worldly beings. Furthermore it appears from various texts in the Antya Līlā section of the Charitāmṛta that irrational animals like dogs, deer, tigers, elephants etc. and peacocks and other birds at the very sight of Gourāṅga suddenly changed their respective nature & habits, made fast embrace of one another in great joy, and, like human beings, in distinct notes uttered the sweet names of Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa, and danced in ecstasy. Again we find elsewhere in the same Charitāmṛta Text—

Prabhu dekhi Vṛndāvanera Vṛkṣalātagaṇa |

Ankura pulaka madhu aśru varisaṇa ||

Phalaphule bhari dāl paṇḍe prabhura pāya |

Vandhu dekhi Vandhu yena bhoṭa lañā yaya ||

Prabhu dekhi Vṛndāvanera Sthāvara jaṅgama |
 Anandita Vandhu yaichhe dekhi Vandhugaṇa || ,

from which it appears that when Lord Gourāṅga arrived at Vṛndāvana, even the trees and plants bristled with ecstatic joy and began to shed tears of delight; laden with fruits and flowers they stooped low to touch the feet of Gourāṅga just in the same way as friends in great joy meet and embrace one another after a long separation. The leading thought underlying all the texts no doubt points to the one fact that even in the hearts of irrational animals and plants and trees there did take place an unforeseen change of feeling under the sole influence of Lord Gourāṅga, and this change was clearly manifested outwardly. Indeed feelings and emotions do arise within the selfs of these worldly beings of the lowest order, but they never get a regular outward manifestation, just in the same way as animals possess certain elements of language like certain elements of consciousness which might serve as the basis of intellectual function, but they do not possess language itself i. e. they cannot express outwardly their thoughts. Outward manifestation of feelings and emotions no doubt depends upon the nature of the stimuli besides the definite character of the organic system. Instances are not rare to show how even a most criminal and cruel mind gets affected with pity if there is a grave intensity of stimuli. The reason therefore why irrational creatures and plants and trees were able to manifest feelings and emotions of ecstatic joy outwardly in the shape of vocal utterances and shedding of tears attended with motor activities, is that there is some astounding speciality and allsurpassing distinction in the self of Lord Gourāṅga whose contact and sight acted as a stimulus in the production of these mental phenomena; and owing to this feature, nowhere else present, Gourāṅga is regarded as the Absolute Being, i.e., as identical with Kṛṣṇa.

The other attribute of displaying a charming gracefulness in all acts, which is distinctly stated in the Charitāmṛta Text ‘माधुर्यं भगवत्ता सार’ as a differentia of the concept of Bhagavān, is inseparably connected with what is stated above. Acts are no doubt done in numberless ways, but all are not given the same importance. Looking to the phenomenal world we find there is a good deal of difference between acts done by brute force and those based upon conciliatory measures. In the sphere of Politics it is indeed found sometimes highly necessary and expedient to take to force in preference to other measures, and this expediency and necessity becomes more and more as the nation is less and less spiritualistic. Hence it is that the principle of nonviolence characterises India far more than other countries. The excellence of conciliation again consists in the fact that the effect accruing becomes more and more permanent, and it contributes a great deal to the establishment of peace and harmony amongst all beings. On this account it is said that there is grace in acts based upon the principle of nonviolence and conciliation. The same holds good also in the case of the acts of the Absolute towards His beings. In this latter case, however, violence is also graceful if the effect thereof is not merely suppression but suppression followed by a greater good bestowed upon the being suppressed. Thus we have already indicated and there are lots of evidence in the Bhāg. texts to show that Kṛṣṇa in all His sports displayed a charming grace. For the purpose of doing good to the universe He suppressed many a demon, though of course in His partial aspect of Viṣṇu; but the demons themselves being thus suppressed were favoured, strange to say, with Release or Mukti. Even those that always acted hostile to Him were rewarded with Release. Kāmpā was such a being. The maxim of ‘Tit for tat’ is always a vile thing. Mischievous

ned by good is always a godly thing. The doings of Christ illustrated this. Perhaps a brighter illustration we find in the Līlā of Kṛṣṇa. The demoness Pūtānā acted hostile towards Him all the time; she was killed, but the killing was followed by a grant of Release. Hersin consists the graceful charm in acts. When again we look to the doings of Lord Gourāṅga we find the same attribute displayed in a more prominent degree. He never used violence in any way towards any being; yet He conquered all by way of reconciliation. His sole object was to grant beatific joy to all beings, and this His mission was fulfilled solely by way of conciliatory measures and never by means of violence or force. All sorts of violence and hostility were shown towards Him by many e. g. Jagāi and Mālharī; but these very persons were favoured with the reward of Premānanda. The idea of graceful charm in acts cannot be conceived beyond this.

It thus appears that on account of the two preeminent attributes, viz, potency for granting beatific joy even to plants, and a display of graceful charm in all acts, manifested in both the Līlās of Kṛṣṇa and Gourāṅga, a complete identity between the two cannot but be established; in other words, Gourāṅga is no other than Kṛṣṇa so far as the philosophical theory is concerned.

It is indicated above that in theory there is complete identity between Kṛṣṇa and Gourāṅga, but there is some difference so far as the līlā is concerned. In order to be able to understand the nature of this difference in sports we are required in the first place to discuss the question why the Absolute Being incarnates partially or full. Our next topic therefore is—

The philosophic necessity, possibility and actuality of Kṛṣṇa = incarnation:—

Before dealing with this topic we have to recapitulate once more what we have already discussed in detail, viz,

that according to the bhāg. view Kṛṣṇa, though included in the list of avatāras, is yet to be regarded not as a mere incarnation but as the Absolute Being Himself whose endless incarnations are appearing in the world in an endless number of ways. The expounders of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism, e.g. Rūpa Goswāmī in his *Laṅgha bhāgavatāmṛta*, have brought out an exhaustive classification of such incarnations. It is not convenient for our present purpose to give a full account of this classification. It will suffice here to indicate that on certain occasions Kṛṣṇa appears in His partial aspect, e.g. Matsya, Kūrma etc., while the urgency of extreme circumstances sometimes necessitates His appearance in His intrinsic selfhood i.e. in the fullest splendour of lordships. In the latter case, again, which is described as Kṛṣṇa incarnation, a gradation is marked on the basis of the principle of charming grace being the guiding force in lordships. This, as we have said before, is the gradation in beatific sports manifested in the three regions—Vṛndāvana, Mathurā and Dvārakā. Being the Absolute Being, Kṛṣṇa is evidently one and the same Identity appearing differently in different aspects. There is thus no difference in theory between the Kṛṣṇa of Vṛndāvana, the Kṛṣṇa of Mathurā and the Kṛṣṇa of Dvārakā,—the difference being in respect of līlā only. A miserable misconception about this vital point has led many to erroneously hold that Kṛṣṇa of Kurukṣetra fame—the subject matter of the Gītā text—is different from Kṛṣṇa of Vṛndāvana—the highest object of worship with the Vaiṣṇavas, some even going so far as to assert that the former is true Kṛṣṇaism while the latter popular or vulgar Kṛṣṇaism. These so called rationalistic thinkers of the east in support of their own pet theory perhaps cite the following Yāmala text quoted in the *L. Bhāgavatāmṛta*, 165, viz—

वृन्दावनं परित्यज्य स कचित् नैव गच्छति ॥

All that we can briefly say in reply is that a cautious look to

the L. Bhāgavatāmṛta context where the verse is cited will at once remove the misconception. The quotation of the verse is preceded by several Bhāg. texts which relate to Kṛṣṇa the son of Nanda and Yaśodā; and the fact that this very Kṛṣṇa at first manifested Himself in the house of Vasudeva, and after being born of and nurtured by Yaśodā went again in sports to Mathurā the place of Vasudeva of the Yādava dynasty, is conclusively established by the L. Bhāgavatāmṛta texts that follow the above verse as well as by the combined implication of various Bhāg. and Ādipurāṇa texts.¹ That Kṛṣṇa as Vāsudeva is the subject matter of the Gītā texts we have already shown in detail. The difference between this Vāsudeva and Nandanandana, which is referred to in the verse quoted, is therefore in respect of līlā only and not in theory. The true meaning of the second line of the verse is that so far as the non-manifest sports are concerned Kṛṣṇa ever revels in beatific sports in the supreme region Vṛndāvana which is then called Goloka. But from the point of view of manifest sports the same Kṛṣṇa manifests differently in the heaven-trio. Of these, in the Vṛndāvana sports the lordship of Kṛṣṇa is completely guided by charming grace, i. e. is always sublimated by the personal relationships between Him and the Gopas and the Gopīs. In the Mathurā sports the guiding force of charm decreasing, the supreme lordships are posited to a greater extent whereby Kṛṣṇa or, strictly speaking, Vāsudeva kills the demoniac being Kāṁsa and siding with the party of Yudhiṣṭhira effects the vanquish and ruin of the party of Duryodhana. The difference, therefore, between Kṛṣṇa of Kurukṣetra fame and Kṛṣṇa the highest object of worship with the Vaiṣnavas is one of aspect only with regard to the beatific sports display-

1. For a discursive account of the Janma līlā of Kṛṣṇa see Gopala champu by Jiva Goswami.

ed. Without entering into a prolixity on the point let us turn to our point at issue.

The general purpose and definition of incarnation is indicated in the L. Bhag text पूर्वोक्ता विश्वकार्यार्थम् अपूर्वा इव चेत् स्वयम् । द्वारान्तरेण वाविः स्युरवतारास्तदा स्मृता : ॥ The meaning of the verse is that when the Absolute Being Kṛṣṇa Himself or His partial manifest (e. g. Nārāyaṇa the Lord of Paravyoman), with the object of doing विश्वकार्य, appears in the world either through (e. g. Kṛṣṇa through Vasudeva, Kāma through Daśaratha) or without (e. g. Matsya) the acknowledged medium of a phenomenal being, we call it an incarnation. The expression विश्वकार्य may mean (a) disturbance of the equilibrium of Prakṛti, followed by the evolutes-mahat etc., (b) causing the delight of the good and the righteous by way of suppressing demoniac beings or evil spirits, (c) affording Premānanda to fervent devotees and indicating the methods of Śuddhābhakti (cf. विश्वरूपं विश्वस्मिन् वा यत् कार्यं प्रकृतिलोभमहदाद्यत्पादनं दुष्टविमर्देन देवादीनां सुखविवर्द्धनं समुत्कृष्टतानां साधकानां प्रेमानन्दविस्तरणं विशुद्धमङ्गिप्रचारणञ्च तदर्थमित्यर्थः ; Valadeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa's gloss on the above text). Of these the meaning (c) is echoed in the two Gītā texts—IV, 7 & 8. The sense of the texts is that whenever there prevails in the world religious anarchism and a growth of irreligion caused by the tyrannous oppression of a demoniac being and his party, the Absolute Being incarnates with the object of suppressing the evil genius and thereby saving the prestige of earnest followers of piety and religion. Such was the case in Rāma incarnation when the oppression of the demon king Rāvana rose to such an abnormal height that for its suppression it necessitated the incarnation of the Absolute. Such was also the case in Nṛsiṃha and other incarnations. Now the implication of such incarnations is that acts of violence are retur-

ned by violence or resistance. These tit for tat methods of remedying evils no doubt display the Karmic function of the Absolute Being ; and the Karmic function again is necessarily implied in the Sandhinī Śakti in as much as the true or concrete existence of a thing lies in action. But a great defect of such methods lies in the fact that they do not appeal directly to the heart of beings, specially to the heart of the evil doer, and consequently have not the prospect of having lasting effects. Besides, as admitted by writers on Bengal Vaiṣṇavism, the act of suppressing demoniac beings in order to keep up the normal peaceful state of the world does not invariably necessitate the incarnation of the Absolute : it may be done even by a Jīva of great godliness. Again, the Jñānic function which is implied in the Samvit Śakti of Bhagavān is displayed in many ways, e. g. through the incarnate beings Nārada, Sanaka, Vyāsa etc. As in the case of the Karmic function, the effects of such Jñānic function also are such that they may accidentally be caused even by a human being of very great intellectual acumen, e. g. Śaṅkara. But, as we have seen, the differentia of the concept of Kṛṣṇa as Swayam Bhagavān lies in His Rāsa or Ānanda Śakti. The genial effects of this Ānandic function are such that they are simply beyond the capacity of an incarnate being—far be it said of a Jīva. Hence it is that to crown all and with the sole object of enjoying supreme bliss Himself and making others relish the same, Kṛṣṇa, the Pūrṇa Sachchidānandāvigraha, Himself incarnated during the end of the Dwāpara yuga. The then state of the country where the tyrannous oppression of Kamsa, Śiśupāla and others brought in religious chaos resulting in the complete forgetal of the principles of Śuddhā bhakti made such complete incarnation of the Absolute Being possible, and the possibility was actualised in the manifest sports of Kṛṣṇa in the supreme heaven-trio. In conclusion we may say that according to V.

ed. Without entering into a prolixity on the point let us turn to our point at issue.

The general purpose and definition of incarnation is indicated in the L. Bhag text पूर्वोक्ता विश्वकार्यार्थम् अपूर्वा इव चेत् स्वयम् । द्वारान्तरेण वाविः स्युरवतारास्तदा स्मृता : ॥ The meaning of the verse is that when the Absolute Being Kṛṣṇa Himself or His partial manifest (e. g. Nārāyaṇa the Lord of Paravyoman), with the object of doing विश्वकार्य, appears in the world either through (e. g. Kṛṣṇa through Vasudeva, / Rāma through Daśaratha) or without (e. g. Matsya) the acknowledged medium of a phenomenal being, we call it an incarnation. The expression विश्वकार्य may mean (a) disturbance of the equilibrium of Prakṛti, followed by the evolutes—mahat etc., (b) causing the delight of the good and the righteous by way of suppressing demoniac beings or evil spirits, (c) affording Premānanda to fervent devotees and indicating the methods of Śuddhābhakti (cf. विश्वरूपं विश्वस्मिन् वा यत् कार्यं प्रकृतौभ्रममहदायत्पादनं दुष्टविमर्देन देवादीनां सुखविवर्द्धनं समुत्कृष्टतानां साधकानां प्रेमानन्दविस्तरणं विशुद्धभक्तिप्रचारणञ्च तदर्थमित्यर्थः, Valadeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa's gloss on the above text). Of these the meaning (c) is echoed in the two Gītā texts—IV, 7 & 8. The sense of the texts is that whenever there prevails in the world religious anarchism and a growth of irreligion caused by the tyrannous oppression of a demoniac being and his party, the Absolute Being incarnates with the object of suppressing the evil genius and thereby saving the prestige of earnest followers of piety and religion. Such was the case in Rāma incarnation when the oppression of the demon king Rāvana rose to such an abnormal height that for its suppression it necessitated the incarnation of the Absolute. Such was also the case in Nṛsiṃha and other incarnations. Now the implication of such incarnations is that acts of violence are retur-

ned by violence or resistance. These tit for tat methods of remedying evils no doubt display the Karmic function of the Absolute Being; and the Karmic function again is necessarily implied in the Sandhinī Śakti in as much as the true or concrete existence of a thing lies in action. But a great defect of such methods lies in the fact that they do not appeal directly to the heart of beings, specially to the heart of the evil doer, and consequently have not the prospect of having lasting effects. Besides, as admitted by writers on Bengal Vaiṣṇavism, the act of suppressing demoniac beings in order to keep up the normal peaceful state of the world does not invariably necessitate the incarnation of the Absolute: it may be done even by a Jīva of great godliness. Again, the Jñānic function which is implied in the Samvit Śakti of Bhagavān is displayed in many ways, e. g. through the incarnate beings Nārada, Sanaka, Vyāsa etc. As in the case of the Karmic function, the effects of such Jñānic function also are such that they may accidentally be caused even by a human being of very great intellectual acumen, e. g. Śaṅkara. But, as we have seen, the differentia of the concept of Kṛṣṇa as Swayam Bhagavān lies in His Rasa or Ānanda Śakti. The genial effects of this Ānandic function are such that they are simply beyond the capacity of an incarnate being—far be it said of a Jīva. Hence it is that to crown all and with the sole object of enjoying supreme bliss Himself and making others relish the same, Kṛṣṇa, the Pūrṇa Sachchīdānandāvighraha, Himself incarnated during the end of the Dwāpara yuga. The then state of the country where the tyrannous oppression of Kāṁsa, Śiśupāla and others brought in religious chaos resulting in the complete forgetal of the principles of Śuddhā bhakti made such complete incarnation of the Absolute Being possible, and the possibility was actualised in the manifest sports of Kṛṣṇa in the supreme heaven-trio. In conclusion we may say that according to V.

Theory the philosophic necessity of Kṛṣṇa incarnation lies in the above function of Ānanda. Indeed the suppression of Kāṁsa, Śiśupāla etc did take place during this incarnation; but such acts are regarded as but collateral to the effects of ānanda. Moreover, these acts were done by Kṛṣṇa not in His highest aspect—the Lord of Vṛṇ dāvana, but in the aspect of Vāsu-deva.¹

If now we want to determine the philosophic necessity of Gourāṅga incarnation, we should remember in the first place that Kṛṣṇa is eternally revelling in the midst of ecstastic sports in constant association with Rādhā, the divinity of His own highest essence of potencies. For the purpose of such sports Kṛṣṇa the Absolute Identity eternally appears amidst diversity, that is to say, as Himself proper and the divinity of Rādhā. The latter therefore may be described as the Viṣaya (विसिनोति वध्नाति यः स विषयः—that which binds is literally called visaya) or that which contributes to the ecstastic joy of Kṛṣṇa, which (Kṛṣṇa) thus is the Āśraya or the substratum in which inheres the supreme joy. Rādhā thus may also be described as the Ideal of a devotee—the ideal which is aimed at for being approached nearer and nearer by the devotion of beings, but never actually reached. Accordingly, in the eternal sports both Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā enjoy supersensuous pleasure, Kṛṣṇa as the Āśraya and Rādhā as the Viṣaya of the sports. Yet there is some difference between the pleasure of Kṛṣṇa and

-
1. On this point refer to the following texts—Swayam Bhagavaner Karma nahe Bharaharana | Sthitikarta Visnu kare jagat palana || Visnu dware Kṛṣṇa kare asura samhar | anusanga karma ai asura marana | ye lagi avatara kahi se mula karana || Premarasa niryyasa karite aswadana | Raga-marga bhakti loka karite prachara ||, Charitamṛta, Adi lila, ch. IV; also—अनुग्रहाय भक्तानां मानुषं देहमाश्रितः । भजते तादृशीः क्रीडायाः श्रुत्वा तत्परो भवेत् ||, Bhag. X, 33, 36.

that of Rādhā, and the reason is obvious on the analogy of the two kinds of pleasure that we as phenomenal beings often enjoy in the two-fold function of devoted and devotee. Separately considered, the pleasure of Kṛṣṇa consists in constant association with and receiving servitude from Rādhā, and this He enjoys in various ways as we come to know from the various sports revealed in the Bhāg. texts; while the pleasure of Rādhā consists in being constantly devoted to and rendering servitude unto Kṛṣṇa in various ways. The pleasure of Rādhā, in other words, is caused by the endless supreme attributes of Kṛṣṇa, and it is Rādhā alone, the sole manifestor of the Mādana Mahābhāva emotion, that realises to the fullest extent what sort of Being Kṛṣṇa is, how inexplicable His supreme beauty is, how gracefully charming His auspicious qualities are. Thus on a careful examination and analysis we may arrive at three things, viz:—(1) that Rādhā enjoys supreme pleasure the highest beatitude of devotion (2) that Rādhā gets it by means of the highest devotion, (3) that Rādhā gets it by way of directing the highest devotional practice towards the inexplicable beauty etc—the charmingly graceful auspicious qualities of Kṛṣṇa. In the manifest sports in the supersensuous heaven of Kṛṣṇa, playing the part of Āśraya, evidently does not realise what an inexplicable charm or grace there is in His own self and what the astounding intensity of Rādhā's devotion is, and consequently does not enjoy the pleasure which Rādhā gets on account of the graceful charm of His own qualities. These three desires therefore remain unfulfilled in the Vraja Līlā. But if Kṛṣṇa is the Absolute Being, no desires can evidently remain unfulfilled in Him, for unfulfilment of any desire would detract from the Infinity and Perfection of the Absolute. The conception of the Absolute necessarily involves that of absolute realisation of all desires. Hence it follows that Kṛṣṇa, if He is to manifest at all His Kṛṣṇaism to the phenomenal world,

must also manifest the realisation of these three desires and for that purpose must play the role of the *Visaya Rādhā*.) So thinking and to satisfy those desires Kṛṣṇa manifested Himself to this phenomenal world in the fifteenth century A. D. as Lord Gourāṅga. It is here to be noted distinctly that the fulfilment of these desires constitutes the *Antaraṅga Kāraṇa* or inner reason for the Gourāṅga cult: and there is another reason, already indicated viz, the desire for revealing to the miserable beings of the earth the eternal cult of Bhakti which had been lying for centuries in a state of dormancy and inaction. As we come to know from the *Gītā* text-

मन्मना भव मद्भक्तो मद्याजी मा० नमस्कुरु ।

मामेवैष्यसि कौन्तेय प्रतिजाने प्रियोऽसि मे ॥

(“Have your mind intent upon me, O, Kounteya Arjuna (by implication, “beings in general”), be my devotee, perform all your sacrificial rites to me, bow down to me; thereby you will attain me even, far be it said of my partial aspects *Paramātmā* and others, I promise this to you and you are dear to me.), during the manifest *Līlā* towards the end of the *Dwāpara Yuga* Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa Himself revealed His own mind that the only way of attaining the summum bonum *Prema* consists in nothing but the devotional worship of Him, and accordingly for the good of beings commanded them to follow this supreme path of religion. But, alas' very few cared for this commandment of Kṛṣṇa; and as a result thereof the beings of the world were put to a great trouble, and plunged themselves into the ocean of endless miseries (the three fold miseries of *Ādhibhowtika*, *Ādhidaivika* & *Ādhyatmika*). Supremely benevolent and merciful as Bhagavān is, He could not bear with this miserable lot of His own beings, and following the maxim ‘Example is better than precept’ appeared as Gourāṅga playing the role of the Ideal Devotee, in

order that the beings might learn the principle of the Bhakti cult direct from His own practices.

The Gourāṅga Līlā may therefore be regarded as a supplement (perhaps more as will be explained later on) to the Līlā of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa in the superensuous heaven trio. But it is to be remembered in this connection that these two līlās are going on eternally; and though their manifest forms take place at different periods of time and in different places of the universe they are eternally going on in the nonmanifest (aprakāṣa) form with simultaneity. For, had it not been the case, the infinity of the beatific sports of Bhagavān would not have been established. In other words, we might say that the beatific sports of Kṛṣṇa the Absolute Being are eternal and infinite, of which the two eternal streams are the Līlā of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa and the Līlā of Gourāṅga. The simultaneity of the two Līlās is to be accepted also because of the fact that the Absolute is no Absolute if it is not the subject (Āśraya) and object (Viśaya) simultaneously. On the points thus explained we may refer to the Charitāmṛta texts:—

Sei premāra Śrī Rādhikā parama āśraya |

Sei premāra āni hai kevala viśaya ||

Ei premadwāre nitya Rādhikā ekali |

Āmāra mā bhuriyāmṛta āśwāde sakali ||

... ..

... ..

... ..

Viśaya jātiya sukha ānār āśwāda |

āmā haite koṭiguṇa āśrayera āhlāda ||

Āśraya jātiya sukha pāite mana dhāya |

Yatne āśwādite nūri ki kari upāya |

Kabhu yadi ei premāra haiye āśraya |

Tave ei premānandera anubhava haya |

Scriptural texts on the theory of Gourāṅga as Advaya Jñāna-tattva:—From the above it appears that Gourāṅga is nothing

but Kṛṣṇa incarnating for the purpose of enjoying the beatific pleasure of Rādhā by way of playing the role of Rādhā herself. But if that is the case, why is the difference in complexion? Being the Absolute Being himself could He not realise this end in His own supersensuous complexion? What hidden significance is there underlying this concealment of His own darkblue complexion and accepting the golden yellow one of Rādhā? In answer to this intricate question Vaiṣṇava philosophers suggest in the first place that, as revealed to the spiritual meditation of the sage Vyāsa, Bhagavān promises to manifest Himself to the world in a concealed form in the Kali yuga. By the influence of the gradual involution of time, religious anarchism evidently prevails in the Kali yuga, and just as for the successful speedy suppression of any political anarchism the most convenient method of operation lies in the system of spy, so also to put an end to the religious anarchism Bhagavān thinks it convenient and prudent to appear in this disguised form.

The concept of Gourāṅga, therefore, roughly indicated above, may be more explicitly and elaborately stated as showing that in Him Kṛṣṇa manifests Himself in the complexion and devotional spirit of Rādhā. In other words, Gourāṅga is Kṛṣṇa within (i.e. in theory) but of golden complexion outside (i.e. from the point of view of *līlā*). In order to establish this theory of Gourāṅga more firmly we might trace it to the Bhāgavata and other scriptural texts. Thus we find the Bhāg. text—**आसन् वर्णस्त्रियो ह्यस्य गृह्णतोऽनुयुगं तनूः । शुक्रो रक्तस्तथा पीत इदानीं कृष्णतां गतः ॥** (X, 8, 13). The verse speaks of the incarnations of the Absolute Being in the Satya and Tretā yugas, as well as of the appearance of the Absolute Being Himself in the Dwāpara and Kali yugas. There is no difficulty about the meaning of the words

शुक्लो रक्तः ; for, on the basis of the two other texts of the Bhā-
 कृते शुक्लश्चतुर्वाहुः and त्रेतायां रक्तवर्णोऽसौ, they mean that in
 the Satya and Tretā yugas respectively Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa ap-
 pears not as such but in partial manifestation, i. e. as two in-
 carnates. Some difficulty however lies with the remaining
 portion of the verse, viz—तथा पीत इदानीं कृष्णतां गतः.
 Apparently the verse means—He (Kṛṣṇa), by way of acknow-
 ledging a form in yuga after yuga, appeared in three comple-
 xions, viz, as Śukla in the Satya yuga, Rakta (red) in the
 Tretā, yellow in Dvāpara, and now (i.e. in Kali) takes to Kṛṣṇa-
 tā i. e. appears as dark-blue Kṛṣṇa. But in this interpretation
 appear two points, viz, (1) that Kṛṣṇa appears in golden com-
 plexion in the Dvāpara, and (2) darkblue in the Kali; and
 thereby the sage Vyāsa would be inconsistent with himself.
 In the first place, on the basis of the clear statement द्वापरे भग-
 वान् श्यामः (Bhāg) there is no doubt in Vayāsas mind about
 the fact that Bhagavān appears as darkblue in the Dvāpara
 and not as golden yellow. Secondly, from the Bhāg. text—

नानातन्त्रविधानेन कलावपि तथा शृणु ।

कृष्णवर्णं त्विषाकृष्णं साङ्गोपाङ्गास्त्रपार्श्वदम् ।

यज्ञैः संकीर्त्तनप्रायैर्यजन्ति हि सुमेधसः ॥

(XI, 5, 29)

as well as from the text:—

सुवर्णवर्णो हेमाङ्गो वराङ्गश्चन्दनाङ्गदी ।

सन्न्यासकृत् समः शान्तो निष्ठशान्तिपरायणः ॥

which occurs in different places in the Mahābhārata, it is quite
 evident that, according to Vyāsa, Bhagavān appears in the
 Kali age in the complexion of golden-yellow. To avoid such in-
 consistency the verse has been thus explained by the commen-
 tator Viśwanātha Chakravartī:—The word तथा has been

used in the verse because of the idea of यथा implied though not explicitly stated, and the word इदानीं is to be understood in the sense of "the transition period between the Dwāpara and the Kali age. Accordingly, the verse means—यथा इदानीं द्वापर-शेषभागे कृष्णतां गतः, तथा इदानीं कलौ पीतः. In other words, the true import of the text is that just as Bhagavān manifests Himself to the phenomenal world in the Dwāpara yuga as Bhagavān, i.e. as the Absolute Being Himself and not in His incarnation, so also in the Kali age He appears as Bhagavān, and not as an incarnate being; and the only difference between these two manifestations is in respect of the complexion, i.e. in the complexion of darkblue or इयाम् in the Dwāpara, and in that of golden yellow in the Kali yuga. The latter point is also corroborated by the other texts referred to above. We are led to conclude, therefore, that the V. theory about Lord Gourāṅga as the Advaya Jñāna Tattwa and not as an incarnate Being is clearly stated in the Bhāg. texts.

Besides the Bhāg. texts, two Up. texts are cited by V. philosophers in support of their Gourāṅga theory. The texts are—(a) यदा पश्यः पश्यते रुक्मवर्णं कर्त्तारमीशं पुरुषं ब्रह्मयेनिम् ete (Muṇḍaka III, 1, 13), (b) महान् प्रभुर्वै पुरुषः सत्त्वस्यैव प्रवर्त्तकः (Śvet. III, 12), quoted by Valadeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa in his commentary on the L. Bhāgavatāmṛta, p. 7. Of these the latter one has perhaps suggested to the expounders of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism the name Mahāprabhu which is generally given to Gourāṅga. There is no doubt that both the texts refer to the concept of Bhagavān, and as such can not be ignored altogether. Yet I must not omit to warn against the curious attempts that are made by some fanatical Vaiṣṇavas of Bengal to show on the authority of these texts that the absoluteness of Gourāṅga is irrespective of Kṛpāśāsa. Of course when they

contend that Gourāṅga is not a mere incarnation but the Absolute Being Himself, nothing goes wrong; but to say that Gourāṅga is not Kṛṣṇa is, from the Vaiṣṇava standpoint, tantamount to conscious imposture and almost amounting to atheism inasmuch as it goes contradictory to the Bhāgavatic view about the Absolute. Since the starting point of Vaiṣṇava philosophic thought is the supreme authoritative-ness of the Bhāgavata, only such arguments are to be regarded as valid as are in agreement with the Bhṛg. mahāvākya कृष्णस्तु etc. The only point worth noticing here is that the two Up. texts quoted above only corroborate the Charitamṛta view about the identity of Gourāṅga with Kṛṣṇa and thereby serve the purpose of making the Gourāṅga cult more acceptable to inquisitive readers.

In the concept of Gourāṅga, again, a difference in complexion is indeed to be understood, but this difference being closely connected with the difference in the nature of beatific sports does not affect the complexion of what Gourāṅga is in His intrinsic selfhood, viz Kṛṣṇa. Accurately speaking, in Gourāṅga there is a happy co-inherence of the characteristics (complexion included) of Rādhā proper as well as those of Kṛṣṇa proper. In Him, it is true, Kṛṣṇa combines the two-fold entities of Himself and Rādhā; but this combination is not to be understood in the sense of a chemical combination in which the combining elements undergo such a thorough change that the nature of each is lost altogether and there is an absolute merge of each other. It is a combination, like that of sugar and curds, in which the compound thus formed is something very peculiar and indescribable, so to say, and behind its screen each of the constituent entities retains its own inherent nature in a hidden manner. In Gourāṅga, therefore, though Kṛṣṇa ordinarily manifests Himself to the phenomenal

world in the complexion and vṛtti or mentality of Rādhā, yet He sometimes manifests Himself as Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa underlying this very figure; and such manifestation depends upon the quantum of religious realisation, as is proved by the fact that Gourāṅga during the manifest Līlā revealed Himself as such not to all His associates and adherents, but to Rāya Rāmānanda alone. Herein lies one of the excellences of the Gourāṅga cult, which we are going to indicate below in detail.

Excellences of the Gourāṅga Cult:-

While stating that the Gourāṅga Līlā is a supplement to the Līlā of Rādhā Kṛṣṇa we already hinted that it is something more than a mere supplement. There are some suggestive statements in the Charitāmṛta Text from which it might be inferred that in Gourāṅga there is the manifestation not only of the beatific sports flowing from the fulfilment of the desires unrealised during the Dwāpara Yuga Līlā, but also of those that He displays during the latter. This simultaneity in the manifestation of ecstatic sports in the two-fold function of Āśraya and Visaya constitutes an excellence of the Gourāṅga Līlā. We have shown how in the hierarchy of divine feelings as manifested in Kṛṣṇa's sports in Goloka or Vṛndāvana there are perceptible all the different stages and shades beginning from the lowest stage of relationship between servant and master and culminating in the highest stage of ecstasy lying in a conjugal tie of relationship between Himself and Rādhā. These different stages are also displayed by Lord Gourāṅga, and perhaps with more explicitness and accuracy in some cases. Not only so, even some of the different grades in the highest stage of ecstasy are displayed by Him. And it is the concealment of the intrinsic selfhood under the garb and mentality of Rādhā-

the Ideal devōtee, that adds to the greater intensity and extensity of these emotional feelings realised in both the functions of Viṣaya and Āśraya. During the Vraja Līlā, although Kṛṣṇa's feeling in general of beatitude in the company of His associates taken as a whole group is an uninterrupted flow, yet it must be admitted that the different kinds of feeling on account of the different classes of associates are marked with a definite line of demarcation, -e. g., the feeling of affection caused by the motherly relationship of Yaśodā is interrupted often and anon by the intervention of other kinds of relationship, and consequently Kṛṣṇa can not realise any particular kind of love at His own sweet will. In this Gourāṅga Līlā, on the other hand, such wantonness in enjoying any kind of love is given a free play and a feeling caused by a particular relationship e. g. Rādhā is not at all interrupted even by the appearance of a different relationship e. g. a motherly one; all this is possible only because of the selfadopted screen which conceals Him from the view of all interventions. In other words, all sorts of convention being wiped off by the force of the concealment, the character of the beatific sports assumes such a high depth of intensity and extensity that it surpasses those of the Vraja Līlā.

There is something more. During the Dwāpara Līlā, the manifestation of the Mahābhāva feeling—of that aspect of the Mahābhāva in which there is a temporary suspension of the difference between subject and object owing to the too exuberant joy and high-flown effusion of love, takes place not always but occasionally, and this is owing to the fact that Kṛṣṇa there acts as the Āśraya in one form (of Himself proper) and Viṣaya in another (i. e. of Rāhā). In the Gourāṅga Līlā, on the other hand, such manifestation takes place always owing to the combination of the two enti-

ties in one single form.¹ In other words the stage of ecstasy called Prema Vilāsa Vivarta which appears occasionally in the previous līlā, attains such an astounding development and reaches such a greatly concentrated form that Gourāṅga is most appropriately described as the embodiment of this unspeakable ecstasy. On account of this suspension of the difference between the subject & object, it might be conceived by many that the end or final aim of the Bhakti cult is the union of God with soul—the complete merging of soul in Brahman. As a set off against this misconception Lord Gourāṅga revealed to Rāya Rāmānanda His dearest associate that in Him behind the screen of the mentality and complexion of Rādhā there are really existing Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā side by side in close contiguity but not in complete union. One of the significances of this revelation is no doubt that the relation between Bhagavān and a devotee is always marked with difference and never with absolute identity, and that the summum bonum of mankind is not complete union with or absolute merge in the Absolute Being, but the attainment of the natural function of devotional worship by way of retaining the relative reality of the individual soul side by side with the Absolute Reality.

-
1. It is here not to be questioned 'How can Kṛṣṇa by playing the part of Viśaya realise the same astounding beatific joy as Rādhā herself can?' For in the first place, Kṛṣṇa being the Absolute Being, nothing is impracticable for His Supreme lordship and inconceivable potency. Secondly, the quality good or bad, and the quantity great or small are confined to the love alone irrespectively of the entity or substance which displays the love. This latter fact again is countenanced even by worldly phenomena, as the poet Bharavi has well said—*वसन्ति हि प्रेक्षि गुणा न वस्तुषु*

The excellence of the Gourāṅga cult thus far indicated is however to be understood so far as the self-appertaining object of Bhagavān is concerned. When again we turn to the beings-appertaining object, we find many things that contribute to the same allsurpassing excellence. In the first place, in the previous Līlā it is indeed true that Bhagavān granted the supreme bliss called Prema even to irrational beings and plants, but this was restricted only to those that were evenly disposed towards Him. The beings like Kāṁsa, Śiśupāla and others that acted hostile to Him throughout their lives attained a bonum no doubt e. g. Release, but this is a very trifling thing in comparison with the summum-bonum-Prema. In this Līlā, on the other hand, all were equally favoured with the highest object of pursuit-whether they were agreeably disposed or not.

Secondly, a display of charming grace in acts no doubt constitutes the highest essence of the absoluteness of Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa; but He did not refrain at times from manifesting lordly potencies by the use of arms for the suppression of beings. In this Līlā, on the other hand, Gourāṅga never used any violence under any circumstances, and yet He subdued all by the slightest touch of His influence. The only weapons or arms He resorted to consisted in His paraphernalia of associates and adherents as we come to know from the Bhāg. text-

कृष्णवर्णं त्विषाकृष्णं साङ्गोपाङ्गाख्यपार्षदम् ।

यज्ञैः संकीर्त्तनप्रार्थैर्यजन्ति हि सुमेधसः ॥

Thirdly, during the previous Līlā, Bhagavān did not play the part of an ideal devotee, and the knowledge of the meaning of Dharma as well as of the means for practical realisation thereof was acquired by beings in general from the impera-

tive commandments and verbal instructions of Bhagavān as laid down in the scriptural texts. But in all spheres of thought, religion included, a mere theoretical knowledge of principles and laws is never a sure guarantee for practical success, specially in the Kali yuga when the general mind is tainted with considerable averseness and the whole atmosphere is surcharged with forgery and purgery. Hence in Gourāṅga playing the role of a devotee, people obtained an easy means for going on in the path of religion. The method again was made easier and more appealing to the mind by the introduction of loud chauntings and citations of the sweet names of Bhagavān in quorum attended with sweet music. The performance of sacrificial or ceremonial rites, which was regarded as an element in Dharma in the previous ages, was replaced by this easier process, as we come to know from the Bhāg. Text cited above.

Fourthly, an all-sided spirit of reconciliation is an important feature in the cult of Gourāṅga. Not only did Gourāṅga establish an unparalleled graceful brotherhood among all beings by means of a nonviolent method of benevolent conciliation, but the expositions of the Hindu Scriptural texts which were made by His adherents and followers have established a charming reconciliation amongst the different theories of the different sects of Religion. Previously to this the great Śaṅkarācāryya, in establishing his pet theory of Pure Monism, left no stones unturned to make a vehement attack and hostile criticisms upon all the prevailing sects—the Śaivas, the Pāsupatas, the Gāṇapatyas and others. But, as we have already explained, the theory of Vaisnava Religion does not hold such a hostile attitude with regard to the other religious theories, and throws no biased strictures upon them. Even the concept of Brahman as made out by Śaṅkara has

been charitably considered, and accorded a conspicuous place in the sphere of religion.

We have so far indicated with sufficient clearness how Gourāṅga is second to none in respect of lordly potencies, of the manifestation of the attribute of bliss, and of the display of the two attributes—the differentia of the concept of Bhagavān; and thus we can conclude that He is nothing but the Advaya Jñāna Tattwā. We have shown further how in Gourāṅga the display of some of the blissful attributes has attained a greater development than in Kṛṣṇa. The relation, therefore, between the Kṛṣṇa cult and the Gourāṅga cult may be briefly stated in the Vaiṣṇava phraseology of *bheda-bheda*—non-difference or identity so far as the theory is concerned, difference so far as the nature of the beatific sports is concerned. The latter thus contributes to the speciality and excellence of the cult of Gourāṅga and plays such an important part in Bengal Vaiṣṇavism.

BOOK IV.

The Cult of Bhakti and the Summumbonum.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL FEATURES OF THE CONCEPT OF BHAKTI.

In the previous pages it was shown how the thing established by the present treatise is the concept of the Advaya Jñāna Tattwā Bhagavān, which is identical with the concept of Kṛṣṇa or Gourāṅga. We further indicated that, though the intrinsic nature of a Jīva is bliss and knowledge and its natural function therefore is to remain for ever in the conti-

guity of and be devoted to Bhagavān, yet one class of Jivas, having from beginningless time deviated away from their natural function, are brought under the influence of the Māyā Śakti and thereby plunge themselves into the ocean of untold miseries—the miseries that consist in transmigration from one body to another ad regressum till the attainment of permanent bliss. Now the question is—what is that means whereby the final end of permanent bliss might be attained ?

That means is not far to seek. It is witl in the self of the being itself. As we have seen, the Jivā is but a potency of Bhagavān ; it necessarily therefore has its own manifestation or function. But this function of devotional practice now remains in a dormant state. Bhagavān also as Paramātmā Purusa is there within the heart of the being. So near to the Being to be worshipped, yet so far away ; such a complete forgetal there has taken place in the Jiva. The Jiva now is quite averse to its own substratum. If, then, a means is to be found out for the positment of the Jivā's own function, it might be briefly pointed out "Well, poor Jiva, the treasure you are seeking is within your dwelling house, the means to find it out is also there : look behind, and you will get it at once." But, alas ! such a valuable instruction is of no avail. It counts for nothing to the Jiva who is still under forgetal, who is still unmindful and lethargic, so to say. The child might remain in-active and indifferent, but the dearest and most loving father Bhagavān cannot be so. The averseness of the Jiva is a very serious malady indeed, and it is the duty of the father any how to find out a remedy. The best remedy of a disease consists in some act which is contradictory to the generating cause thereof (हेतुप्रत्यनिकचिकित्सा or निदानपरिवर्जनम् as Hindu pathology says). And so the scriptural texts prescribe a means which counteracts the averseness of the Jiva

and restores the natural function. This means is called Bhakti, which again, as the derivative meaning (भज्+क्ति भावे) shows, means the practice of devotion. Thus it is stated in the Bhāg. text—

भयं द्वितीयाभिनिवेशतः स्याद्रीशादपेतस्य विपर्ययोऽस्मृतिः ।

तन्माययातो बुध आभजेत्तं भक्त्यैक्येशं गुरुदेवदात्मा ॥

(XI, 2, 37)

from which it appears that since the Jīva withdraws from the Lord, by the influence of the Māyā Śakti it has its own intrinsic self-hood not posited, and identifying itself with objects like body, senses etc. it incurs a fear of endless sorrows; and such fear, originated as it is by the Śakti of Bhagavān, can be counteracted only by devotional practices—the practices that are to be guided by a spiritual preceptor. What the text signifies is that the influence of the Māyā Śakti of Bhagavān upon the Jīva can be counteracted by nothing else than another attribute, i.e., Bliss, of the same Being Bhagavān; and realisation of this Bliss is possible only by means of the practice of devotion. This very idea is also expressed in clear terms in the Gītā Text—दैवी ह्येषा गुणमयी मम माया दुरत्यया ।

मामेव ये प्रपद्यन्ते मायामेतां तरन्ति ते ॥

which means that "this my Māyā Śakti is difficult of suppressing; those only can get out of it who are attached to me with an undivided mind."

Bhakti or Devotion is thus described as the means for attainment of the blissful knowledge of Bhagavān. Bhakti again, as the derivation shows, is a synonym for Upāsana or Dhyāna, which again means a continuity of steady remembrance uninterrupted like the flow of oil. All the Vedānta texts aim at establishing this as the only means. Thus in the Sūtra-
IV, I, 1 "आवृत्तिरसङ्गदुपदेशात्" the sage Vyāsa points to door

same conclusion. With this again agree scriptural texts such as "Having known Him let him practise meditation" (Vṛh. Up. IV, 4, 21); "Meditate on the Self as Om. (Mund. 11, 2, 6); Let a man meditate on the Self only as his world (Vṛh., 1, 4, 15) "The Self is to be seen, to be heard, to be reflected on, to be meditated on (Chhā VIII, 7, 1). (Nor is it to be redargued that in Bhakti mārga 'knowledge' has no place; for the terms 'knowing' and 'meditating' are seen to be used in the place of each other (inter-changeable) in the earlier (उपक्रम) and later (उपसंहार) parts of Vedict texts.) Compare the following passages—"Let a man meditate on mind as Brahman," and "He who knows this shines and warms through his celebrity, fame and glory of countenance" (Chhā. III, 18, 1 & 6). "He does not know Him, for he is not complete," & "Let men meditate on Him as the Self. (Vṛh. Up. I, 4:7); and, "He who knows what he knows": & "Teach me the Deity on which you meditate" (Chhā. IV 1, 6; 2, 2).¹

The Gītā also teaches the same doctrine; "Neither by the Vedas, nor by austerities, nor by gifts, nor by sacrifice can I be so seen as thou hast seen me, but by devotion exclusive I may in this form be known and seen in truth, O Arjuna, and

-
1. It is to be carefully noted here that the very word Bhakti at once suggests the idea of knowledge; for Bhakti means steady remembrance uninterrupted like the flow of oil and remembrance is surely included in knowledge. It is further to be remembered that only such knowledge as relates to the identity between God and soul has no place in the Bhakti mārga; whereas the concept of Bhagavan, the concept of, Jiva the concept of the relation between the two, various other concepts, which are nothing but various aspects of knowledge, are accorded a most conspicuous place in this mārga.

also be entered into", (XI, 53, 54); "That Highest Person, O Pārtha, may be obtained by exclusive devotion (VIII, 22).

The importance of the concept of Bhakti requires an elaborate exposition, the mere because there are different statements about its significance. To describe Bhakti as one means is rather to minimise its import. As indicated above, it is the only natural function of a Jīva, and hence it is the highest Dharma. By Dharma we understand 'that duty or sacrament which is practised by those that are really learned in, or have realised, the highest lore—the scriptural texts, and that are devoid of attachment or averseness to worldly objects; this duty must at the same time be approved of by one's own conscience or Reason.' Conscience, again, approves of that only which contributes to the being's pleasure; and such pleasure, when conceived in accordance to the highest import of the Scriptures, is nothing but permanent bliss. Hence it is that, though there might be many minor duties, the highest duty of a being is described in all Śruti and Smṛti texts as Vidyā or Ātma-jñāna. In other words, this highest duty is Devotion as appears from the various texts cited above. Thus also we find it stated in the Bhāg. text—

✓ स वै पुंसां परो धर्मो यतो भक्तिरधोक्षजे ।
अहैतुक्यप्रतिहता ययात्मा सुप्रसीदति ॥ (I, 2, 6)

The meaning is this—the highest duty is devotion to the Supreme Being, which devotion consists in श्रवण, मनन & निदिध्यासन. The consummation of Dharma, again, lies in the supreme pleasure of Bhagavān as the text स्वनुष्ठितस्य धर्मस्य संसिद्धिः हरितोषणम् (Bhāg. I, 2, 13) clearly indicates. The underlying motive of the duty of devotion, therefore, is absolutely disinterested; it is a duty which flows as a natural function and with the sole object of contributing to the supreme pleasure of Bhagavān and without the least reference and concern to the doer

himself in any respect. (In other words, Bhakti must be अहैतुकी, that is to say, it should not be impelled by any the least desire for any other effect (to accrue in any existence whatsoever) than the supreme pleasure of Bhagavān; and because this is the only function of a Jīva and the Jīva is finite bliss and knowledge, the effect of supreme pleasure or beatitude on the part of Bhagavān must follow unimpeded. This concept of Bhakti as Ahaitukī and Apratihatā reminds one of the Kantian doctrine of the Categorical Imperative of Duty; and we may venture to add that what the critical philosopher describes as 'Duty for duty's sake' applies preeminently only to this concept of Bhakti. This differentiating characteristic of Bhakti, again, which the Bhāg. texts so clearly and emphatically lay down, is also supported by various Scriptural texts. Thus the Gopāla Tāpanī says भक्तिरस्य भजनं तदिहामुत्रोपाधि-नैरास्येनामुष्मिन् मनःकल्पनमेतदेव नैष्कर्म्यम्, where the phrase इहामुत्रोपाधिनैरास्येन clearly states that the practice of devotion or the soul's activity with a view to the sole pleasure of Kṛṣṇa must not be guided by the motive of any consequence whatsoever either in this world or in the next. The Śatapatha Śruti also states—"स होवाच याज्ञवल्क्यस्तत् पुमान् आत्महिनाय प्रेक्षा हरिं भजेत्", "Yājñavalkya said—'Therefore (i. e. owing to the absence of a better means) an individual being should be devoted to Hari in premis for the sake of his own good.' Indeed according to the theory of Vaisnava Philosophy the summum bonum of beings, as will be elucidated later on, is on a stage of Bhakti in which the attainment of supreme beatific joy is a concomitant consequence; but to understand the concept of Bhakti in this the highest stage it is to be distinctly remembered that in the soul's activity about its own function of devotion there should not be a previous thought about the sup-

reme pleasure. The devotion is servitude to Kṛṣṇa, and servitude simply for the sake of servitude. Indeed in this servitude supreme pleasure would come in as a matter of course in the shape of emotional feelings in the various delicacies and niceties, and, owing to the very close relation between the mind and the body, various physiological changes like crying, laughing, benumbing, fainting etc. would take place in consequence; but such a great emphasis is laid upon the function of servitude that even the supreme pleasure along with the consequent, physiological changes would be regarded as disagreeable if at all it is an obstruction to this act of servitude. At this stage the Ahaitukī or Akiñchana Bhakti is styled Prema Bhakti in which nothing remains but an insatiable hankering after rendering servitude to Bhagavān. And, as we have already said, Bhagavān shakes off His indifference and impartiality, if for any reason at all, simply for the sake of a devotee of this type—nay, He, the vanquisher of all else, is himself conquered by an insatiable hankering alone (cf. भक्तिरेवैनं नयति, भक्तिरेवैनं दर्शयति, भक्तिवशः पुरुषो भक्तिरेव भूयसी—Māthara Śruti; अहं भक्तपराधीनो ह्यस्वतन्त्र इव द्विज । साधुभिर्ग्रस्तहृदयो भक्तैर्मक्तजनप्रियः ॥ (Bhāg. IX, 4, 64). Perhaps with an eye to this significant feature the commentator Valadeva Vidyābhāṣana has given a nice exposition of the concept of Bhakti in his Siddhāntaratna, viz, भगवद्वशोकाग्रेतुभूता भक्तिः किं स्वरूपेति, किं प्राकृतसत्त्वमयज्ञानानन्दस्वरूपा, किं वा भगवज्ज्ञानानन्दरूपा, अथवा जैवज्ञानानन्दरूपा उत ह्लादिनीसारसमधेतसम्बित्साररूपा इति । नाद्यः, भगवतो मायावश्यताश्रयणात् स्वतः पूर्णत्वाच्च । न द्वितीयः, अनिशयासिद्धिः । नापि तृतीयः, जैवयोस्तयोः क्षीदिष्टत्वात् । किन्तु चतुर्थ एवासौ भवेत् ।

“If Bhakti is the instrumentality for subjugating Bhagavān, what forsooth is its definite character? In reply thereto, four

possible alternatives might be suggested, viz-(1) that it consists of that knowledge and pleasure which is to be derived from development of the Sattva Guṇa—a constituent element of the primeval matter called Prakṛti; (2) that it consists of the feeling of pleasure and knowledge that exists in Bhagavān (3) that it is made up of the knowledge and pleasure residing in an individual soul; (4) that it consists of the essence of the Hlādinī potency combined with the knowledge—Samvit. The first alternative cannot be accepted, because then it would follow that Bhagavān is conquered by the Māyā Śakti, contrary to the fact that Bhagavān in His intrinsic selfhood is quite unaffected by Māyā. Neither is the second alternative tenable, for, in that case, it would follow that the bliss and knowledge of Bhagavān, regarded as products, conquers Him, and thereby the infinity and perfection of Bhagavān would become question-able. That Bhagavān though of infinite knowledge and bliss feels greater pleasure on account of His devotee is due not to himself but to His devotee and thus it is not conflicting with His infinity and perfection. Nor can we uphold the third alternative, for the simple reason that the finite pleasure and knowledge of an individual soul is not at all capable of conquering Bhagavān of infinite Knowledge and Bliss. The fourth alternative alone is to be accepted, and thereby the concept of Bhakti would imply that it is the essence of the Bliss potency of Bhagavān combined with His knowledge potency” This combined essence again is something eternal lying within the constant associates of Bhagavān-in-His beatific-sports and acting as a desire for the sole purpose of contributing to the supreme pleasure. It is like an eternal inexhaustible current of bliss flowing from the endless inexhaustible reservoir—the beatific associates, and descending through the canal-like eternally-released souls down into the phenomenal world, thereby soften-

ing and melting to ecstatic joy the hearts of beings dried up and scorched with the rays of vain delusions and empty abstractions of the so-called speculative thought. From this exposition of the concept of Bhakti which describes it as the bliss potency of Bhagavān it also appears that between Bhagavān and Bhakti there exists the same relation of Bhedābheda as signalises the whole theory of Vaiṣṇava Philosophy.

Bhakti, being the highest Dharma, necessarily implies an act; besides, its nature is bliss and knowledge. Thus the full concept of Bhakti implies the harmonious combination of the three things, viz. Bliss, Knowledge and Act. These three constituent elements of Bhakti require an elaborate explanation. These are all potencies no doubt whereby the supreme pleasure of Bhagavān is effected and which also inevitably and unconsciously (on the part of the devotee) lead to that supreme pleasure called Premānanda. The meaning of bliss and knowledge has already been sufficiently explained, viz. that the happiness or pleasure which is the consequence of Bhakti is not the sensuous pleasure or transient happiness which we find in the phenomenal world, but the permanent pleasure or happiness which has no parallel in the world; and that knowledge means not the knowledge of one non-differenced Substance as established by purely monistic thinkers but the knowledge of the Advaya Jñāna Tattva Bhagavān. Before we understand the meaning of 'act' here we are to remember the fact that Dharma is classified by some into Pravittilakṣaṇa and Nivittilakṣaṇa. The sacraments like ceremonial rites which the Śrutis enjoin us to perform with a view to attaining higher regions like sensuous heaven and the like come under the province of the former class. But from the Śruti text "तद् यथेह कर्मजितो लोकः क्षीयते एवमेवामुत्र पुण्यजितो लोकः क्षीयते" it appears that all the regions higher or lower which are acquired in consequence of

such acts are merely transient ones, and hence such Dharma or acts leading to transient happiness can not come under the category of the highest Dharma leading to permanent bliss. The practices, again, that are adopted for the sole object of attaining release in the way prescribed by the school of Śaṅkara, come within the scope of the latter class; those might be superior to the Pravṛttilakṣaṇa Dharma in that there is no desire for elysium and the like, but they do not lead to the effect of soul's contiguity with Bhagavān if they are practised as such and not with a starting faith in the concept of Bhagavān. Bhakti is a Dharma higher than these two classes; it is the highest Dharma, and the acts implied in the concept of Bhakti are other than those acts which are described as incumbent (नित्य), occasional (नैमित्तिक) and voluntary (काम्य) and mean such acts as hearing of scriptural texts, worshipping the highest Deity, and the like.

Though the full concept of Bhakti as indicated above implies the three things viz bliss, knowledge and act, yet it is to be distinctly remembered that the primary function of Bhakti consists in the directing of the mind solely towards the pleasure of Bhagavān, and the other two products viz 'knowledge of Bhagavān' and 'averseness to all sorts of phenomenal acts', though not attended to in the beginning, will follow as a matter of course. From what we have said about the highest stage of Bhakti it is quite evident that the ultimate effect of Bhakti is the clear perception of Bhagavān—the sight of Bhagavān in the same way as we phenomenal beings have a direct perception of phenomenal objects. This statement does not conflict with the fact that Bhakti is Upāsana or an unimpeded flow of thought; for it is a psychological truth that thinking carried on to a very high pitch of intensity becomes tantamount to direct perception. This very idea is clearly stated

in the Śruti text आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदि-
 द्यासितव्यश्च (Vṛh. II, 4, 5, and also Vṛh. IV, 5, 6.). "Ātmā
 or the Highest Self is to be seen. How? By the processes
 of (1) hearing of scriptural texts, (2) thinking that these
 scriptural texts aim at Bhakti as the only means, and (3) carry-
 ing on steady remembrance in an uninterrupted flow. If, there-
 fore, the effect of Bhakti is even a direct preception of Bhaga-
 vān who is far beyond the sphere of Māyā, there is no doubt
 that the conquest of Māyā would follow necessarily as a con-
 comitant consequence. Māyā being conquered, the soul would
 no longer have to undergo the troubles of mundane existence,
 and evils and miseries would be completely suppressed. To
 this effect the Śruti says—मिथ्यते हृदयग्रन्थिश्चिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः ।

क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन् दृष्टे परावरे ॥ The supreme Lord
 being seen, all fetters of the heart are rent as-under (i. e., sub-
 jection between the soul living in the heart and the body
 is put an end to), all doubts are removed (i.e., non-belief in
 the supreme Lord is removed by means of the hearing of scrip-
 tural texts, belief in a Being other than the supreme Lord
 Kṛṣṇa is gone by means of steady thought based upon those
 texts, and when that Supreme Lord is actually seen the seer
 no longer entertains any diffidence about attaining Him, nor
 does he consider himself as inclined to attain any thing else),
 all acts cease and hence metempsychosis which is the inevita-
 ble result of such acts is completely put an end to. It might
 be pointed out here that the text cited above, irrespectively
 of any commentary, from the very wording, clearly states
 that there is some difference and not absolute identity between
 God and individual soul.

The nature of Bhakti in the highest stage called Prema
 Bhakti as indicated above is indeed such a high pitch of inten-
 sity in religious speculation that it can never be easily attain-

ned, the more in view of the fact that a distraction acts upon the mind in an endless number of ways. Actual sight of the Lord is no doubt a boon which can be acquired only by passing through successive stages of meditation and practice carried on for thousands of years. Vaiṣṇava Philosophy classifies these stages into nine, viz, Śrādhā, Sādhya, Bhajanakriya, Anarthanivṛtti, Niṣṭhā, Ruchi, Āsakti, Bhāva and Prema. By Śrādhā is meant faith. This faith however is not to be confused with that intuitive belief in the Absolute which characterises every individual being; it means faith in the scriptural texts of the Hindus, for it is the scriptural texts that give us a knowledge of the definite character of the Absolute. Hindu Religion starts with such belief in the scriptures which have already been established as the best authority in matters of religion. But mere faith will count for nothing; rather it is very likely to fade away, unless it is made to be deep-rooted in the mental principle; and this can be effected more successfully and positively by association with religious souls. Like attracts like, one single example is better than hundred precepts—such maxims apply in all matters, none the less in religion. Thus the next step towards religious realisation is an well-chosen association with men treading in the same path of religion and already having proceeded a little ahead. So the Bhāg. text says

शुश्रूषोः श्रद्धानस्य वासुदेवकथारविः ।

स्यान् महत्सेवया विप्राः पुण्यनीर्थनिपेवणात् ॥ (I. 2, 16).

From the verse it appears that an association with suitable religious souls is achieved preeminently by living in holy lands like the super-sensual heaven-land mentioned before. To this effect, methinks, the author of the *Charitāmṛta* includes Mathurāvāsa (residence in Mathurā) amongst the five āṅgas of Sādhana Bhakti to be discussed later on. I am

afraid there is some misconception in the minds of many about the true significance of this tenet. What the Scriptural texts on this point really mean to imply is this—saintly characters and fervent devotees are necessarily inclined to live in secluded holy places, remote from the distracting crowds of societies; and if one having already acquired a faith in the scriptures goes to such places even for secular purposes, he might accidentally meet those saints, and, being influenced by their devotional practices both outward and inward, himself might be more and more inclined to adopt such courses of conduct, and thereby his faith instead of fading away will develop more and more and will lead him a-head in the path of religion. It is however never intended by the theory of Vaisṇava Philosophy that religious realisation in the Bhakti cult can never be attained without residing in holy lands. All that is meant is that a residence in such places, on the basis of congenial association, will afford one more facilities for religious progress than in the midst of bustles of the town and the like. Being afforded such hopeful facilities the devotee will thenceforth gladly engage his more time and attention in reading and hearing scriptural texts and meditating and contemplating over the beatific sports of Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa. In consequence thereof the concept Bhagavān will constantly occupy his thought and efface all the impressions upon his mental principle of previous existences—the impressions which, if not thus restrained, would have led to more and more mundane existences. With the effacement of the impressions there will arise within the mind an uninterrupted flow of steady thought about Kṛṣṇa, and such steady thought going on for years together will ultimately lead to that stage of Bhakti in which there is a clear direct perception of Bhagavān in His fullest splendour and bliss, and an uninterrupted

enjoyment of supreme pleasure called Premānanda; and there by the summumbonum will be attained.¹

The general features of Bhakti are thus described; and because the Absolute is no other than Kṛṣṇa, devotion undoubtedly means devotion to Kṛṣṇa. Hence Bhakti—strictly speaking Ahaitukī or Uttamā (Excellent) Bhakti—is defined as **आनुकूल्येन कृष्णानुशीलनम्** or doing whatever

is pleasing to Kṛṣṇa. Broadly speaking, the concept of Bhakti implies that whatever acts there might be conceived, whatever other means for religious realisation there might be upheld, whatever varieties of knowledge or penance or ceremonial rites or phenomenal activities there might be enjoined in the tenets of various scriptural texts, must be all based upon an implicit faith in the Absolute Kṛṣṇa. This very idea

is clearly stated in the Bhāg. text **वासुदेवपरा वेदा वासुदेवपरा मखाः । वासुदेवपरो योगो वासुदेवपराः क्रियाः ॥ वासुदेवपरं ज्ञानं वासुदेवपरं तपः । वासुदेवपरो धर्मो वासुदेवपरा गतिः ॥** (I, 2, २९-

२९). "The Vedas are the direct revelation of Kṛṣṇa, and hence whatever is laid down therein ultimately refers to Him alone. The sacrificial rites enjoined in the Vedas must be performed with a strict faith in Him. The bodily practices enjoined in the Yoga system must be accomplished only with the object of preparing the mind for an approach towards Kṛṣṇa; the realisation of non-differenced Substance or Brahman cannot be really attained at any rate, cannot be lasting, if it is not based upon a faith in Kṛṣṇa. The acts, again, which are prescribed for different sects or societies or communities under different stages of life must be done with a faith in Kṛṣṇa alone." The concept of Bhakti thus does not imply

1. See Appendix.

that phenomenal beings are never to do any acts according to their respective age, sex, caste, creed or social status or surrounding environments; all that is really meant is that such acts are allowable but must be done with a faith in Kṛṣṇa. Nor does it indicate that the other means for realisation are to be ignored altogether or that the different manifestations or incarnations of Kṛṣṇa are to be disbelieved. On the other hand, with the evershining spirit of reconciliation it admits all these things, and yet, by way of showing their nature as ultimately based upon a belief in Kṛṣṇa the Absolute Being, it posits its own transcending nature and excellence over everything else. Complete resignation, steadfast adherence, and insatiable hankering—these alone can make one attain a full realisation of Bhagavān as such; and phenomenal activities, or acts with a view to realisations of the different manifestations of the Highest Self, which from their very nature cannot be forsaken abruptly, are to be done unless and until such a state of the mind is attained, and an attempt must be made for such a preparation from the very dawning of intellect and reasoning.

CHAPTER II.

RELATION BETWEEN THE CULT OF BHAKTI AND OTHER CULTS.

In the preceding pages which give a brief account of the general features of Bhakti the concept of Bhakti has been described as the highest Dharma or the best means for realisation. But the Hindu scriptural texts, we are aware, refer to many other modes of realisation which are broadly classified into Karma mārga, Jñāna mārga, and Yoga mārga; and to establish the Bhakti cult on a sound basis we are required to show its superiority over the other cults—a superiority which has already been partially indicated in a previous chapter.

Karma mārga: This is based upon the **Karma Kāṇḍa** or the beginning portion of the Vedas, the latter being the **Jñāna Kāṇḍa**. The **Karma Kāṇḍa** lays down injunctions for the performance of ceremonial rites, while the **Jñāna Kāṇḍa** deals with the Unseen Object—the Absolute Being (this is otherwise called the **Adṛṣṭārtha**—**pratipādaka Śāstra**). The implication of the two canons underlying this classification is that experience falls into two classes, viz, (1) that which refers to the sensuous, (2) that which refers to the Supersensuous. Although the ancient propounders of Hinduism confined their greater attention to the portion which treats of Brahman the Supersensuous Object, yet it is not to be understood that the **Karma Kāṇḍa** has no value at all. On the otherhand, since the **Karma Kāṇḍa** is a part of the scriptures, it is evidently the intention of **Bhagavān** that this has its own value and efficacy even so far as the question of self-realisation i.e. realisation of the Supersensuous is concerned. What then is the significance of the **Karma Kāṇḍa**?

Now the injunctions for the performance of ceremonial rites have the apparent object of affording individual beings all sorts of facilities for worldly enjoyments. Thus we may regard as a makeshift, as it were, on the part of **Bhagavān**. In other words, the acts enjoined in the vedas are styled **परोक्षक्रिया** (cf. *Śruti* quoted in *Bhakti-sandarbhā* p. 473—“तं वा एतं चतुर्दुतं सन्तं चतुर्होनेत्याचक्षते परोक्षेण परोक्षक्रिया एव हि वेदाः”), and the Vedas in this respect are necessarily a **परोक्षवादः**.¹ Now what is a **परोक्षवादः**? It is that in which the real meaning lies hidden under the garb of certain statements which apparently mean otherwise. Consider the following example—A child attacked with malarial fever is very much disinclined to take quinine because of the bitter taste; but the

1. See Appendix.

father, very much inclined to get the child cured, tempts him with sweetmeats, and then the child takes the quinine. The real motive of the father here is not to give the child sweetmeats but to get him cured of the disease, and this motive lies concealed under the garb of a temptation. Similarly, the real motive underlying the vedic injunctions for ceremonial rites is to make the doers ultimately forsake them. If then this is the real motive, why do not beings avoid these at the very outset? They cannot. Beings as they are, they must necessarily do some acts—can never remain in-active. In the absence of performance of such vedic acts which are all morally right, they are sure to do forbidden acts such as drinking, debauchery, theft and others; they must, in other words, addict themselves to all sorts of immoralities and vices, and thereby prepare their own way for eternal damnation. Besides, the performance of such acts is according to our theory commanded by Bhagavān Himself and hence can not be avoided for fear of transgression.

It appears, therefore, that vedic rites, though not to be ignored, have got only a secondary importance attached to them. To this effect the scriptures state—**यो वा एतदक्षरं गार्ग्यविदित्वाऽस्मिँल्लोके जुहोति यजते तपस्तप्यते वहूनि वर्षसहस्रा-
ण्यन्तवदेवास्य तद् भवति ; यो वा एतदक्षरं गार्गि अविदित्वा अस्माँ-
ल्लोकात् प्रैति स कृपणः ; अथ य एतदक्षरं गार्गि विदित्वा अस्माँ-
ल्लोकात् प्रैति स ब्राह्मणः ।** (Vṛh. VIII, 10). What the texts mean is that only a secondary importance is attached to the ceremonial rites enjoined in the Vedas while the knowledge of Brahman is of primary importance, and that one possessed of this knowledge is really rich irrespectively of caste, sex etc. From these texts as well as from the text **तमेतं वेदानु-
वचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति ब्रह्मचर्येण** (Vṛh. IV, 4, 22) it ap-
pears that the ultimate real motive of the performance of

ceremonial rites is to acquire knowledge of Brahman. To satisfy this object the vedic acts must be performed without the least desire for the effects thereof. In other words, performance of acts without any attachment thereto is what prepares the way for final release. It is by such performance of acts that the mind is reduced to that state of tranquility and composure in which a desire for Ātmajñāna might arise.

Thus at last we arrive at the true meaning of the Karma mārga which is described elaborately and in clear terms in the beginning of the Gītā. The Karmamārga does not imply absolute nonperformance of acts, but means that acts are to be done without any the least desire for attainment of effects; and if in this method actual realisation is to be attained at all, the performance of such acts must be completely resigned to Bhagavān. Resignation of vedic ceremonial rites to Bhagavān, therefore, is described as one means for the attainment of Release; but this means being only a preparatory one, the effect in the shape of release takes place after a good deal of time, and when at length release is attained the state is one collateral with a complete cessation of all such acts—with all fetters of the heart being rent asunder. If, again, the cult of Bhakti is resorted to, the same release accrues as a concomitant consequence and that in no time, owing to the supremely magnetic influence of the graceful attributes of Bhagavān. Thus it appears that a more efficacious and speedy method lies in the cult of Bhakti whereby the highest bonum is attained. In other words, the Bhakti Mārga is to be regarded not only as superior to the Karma Mārga, but that which, if resorted to, does away with the necessity of the latter being adopted as an independent method. This theory, therefore, leads us to the statement that the Karma Mārga (and not the Bhakti Mārga, as some modern interpreters of Indian Philosophy erroneously

put it) is intended only for the weak and the lowly. This superiority of the Bhakti cult and inferiority of the Karma Mārga in the hierarchy of methods is clearly stated in the Gītā texts—मय्येव मन आधत्स्व मयि बुद्धिं निवेशय । निवसिष्यसि मय्येव अत ऊर्ध्वं न संशयः ॥ अथ चित्तं समाधातुं न शक्नोषि मयि स्थिरम् । अभ्यासयोगेन ततो मामिच्छाप्तुं धनञ्जय ॥ अभ्यासेऽप्यसमर्थोऽसि कर्तुं मद्योगमाश्रितः । सर्वकर्मफलत्यागं ततः कुरु यतात्मवान् ॥ (XII, 8-11) which, if properly understood, mean nothing but that of the several alternative methods held up by Bhagavān, the highest one is stated first and the lowest one i.e. resignation of ceremonial rites stated last.

Jñāna mārga:—While the Karma mārga indicated above is declared a means for realisation only in an indirect and remote way, the direct and positive methods for this purpose are two in number—Jñāna and Bhakti. So the bhāg. text says—योगास्त्रयी मया प्रोक्ता नृणां श्रेयो विधिन्सया । ज्ञानं कर्म च भक्तिश्च नोपायोऽन्योऽस्ति कुत्रचित् ॥ (XI, 20, 6). The Bhakti mārga, again, includes as one variety the Yoga mārga; hence we have referred to four methods in all, viz, Karma, Jñāna, Yoga (bhakti) and Bhakti.

The Jñāna mārga is generally understood by people in these days as based upon and originated in Śaṅkara's theory of Absolute monism; but from the detailed reference to it in the Bhāgavata and Gītā texts it is quite evident that the cult of Jñāna had long been in vogue before the time of Śaṅkara.

This mārga consists in the realisation of Bhagavān in His Nirviśeṣa state. It is the realisation in which there takes place a merge or absorption of an individual soul in Brahman which Brahman is regarded as the halo of the supreme lustre of the supersensuous limbs of Bhagavān, and there-

by the realiser does nothing, says nothing, thinks of nothing good or bad, and behaves like an inert mass, as it were,—in fact it is an indescribable state.

From the bhāg. texts it appears that followers of the Jñāna mārga are primarily classified into two, viz—(1) those that take to meditation upon Nirviśeṣa Brahman in an independent way, i. e., irrespectively of an implicit faith in Bhagavān, (2) those that take recourse to a sincere faith in and devotion to Bhagavān from the very outset, but desire to attain the end of Release and not the summum bonum Prema.¹ (cf. Jñāna mārga Upāśaka dvi ta prakāra | Kevala brahman-upāśaka mokṣākāṅkṣī āra ||, Charitāmṛta, Madhya līlā, ch 24). The first class admits of three sub-classes, viz, Sādhaka, Brahma-maya and Prāpta-brahma-līya. Under the second class also there are three sub-classes, viz, (1) Mumukṣu or those desirous of (but not yet having attained) Release, (2) Jivānmukta, (3) Prāptā-swarūpa (cf. Mokṣākāṅkṣī jñāni haya tina prakāra | Mumukṣu Jivānmukta Prāpta-swarūpa āra , Charitāmṛta, Madhya, ch. 24). Of these latter sub-classes, the first type is referred to in the bhāg. text—**मुमुक्षवो घोररूपान् दित्वा भूतपत्नीन्थ । नारायणकलाः शान्ता भजन्ति ह्यनसूयवः** ||, I, 2, 26. In other words, those worldly beings that calmly perform devotion to Kṛṣṇa with the desire for attaining Release come under this sub-class. Such desire, however, is removed from their mind if fortunately they are favoured with the company and association of saintly Jevotees or with the grace of Bhagavān Himself in the shape of a flash of vision; and thenceforth they continue their devotional process for the sake of Bhakti proper. The second sub-class consists of those that, even after having attained Release, are found to act and conduct for some time like phenomenal beings, bearing

1. See Appendix.

the semblance of unreleased souls encased in gross bodies, just in the same way as an oil machine or a potter's wheel continues its turn for some time even after the application of the moving force has stopped. The third type consists of those that by means of the devotional cult have attained the intrinsic natural state of Jivas absolutely bereft of any connection with gross bodies (cf. मुक्तिर्हित्वान्यथारूपं स्वरूपेण व्यवस्थितिः, Bhāg. II, 10, 6). Notwithstanding the difference in minute details, all these three sub-classes agree in one point, viz, that the end to be attained is one and the same i.e., Self-realisation or merge of the soul in Brahman

Between the two varieties of Jñāna mārga indicated above, which agree in so far as the end attained is Release, there is a good deal of difference. In the latter case, since Bhakti is primarily resorted to, the state of merge will not last long, but Bhagavān Himself by reason of that Bhakti which is but His own potency will uplift the being from that state after allowing him to enjoy it for some time as a fulfilment of his own desire; and the being thus raised from the state of immersion in the illimitable ocean of Bhagavān's bodily lustre will be placed in the state of contiguity with Bhagavān to enable him to enjoy supreme pleasure. In the former case, since the practice of meditation upon Brahman is conducted independently of Bhakti and based entirely upon the being's own power of understanding, the state of merge might be attained after a good deal of effort, but will not have a lasting effect. Lots of instance there are to show how an ascetic of this kind is drowned again into the ocean of troubles in mundane existence. Consequently all the efforts for realisation independently of Bhakti are entirely fruitless just in the same way as the pounding of husks is an absolutely fruitless attempt. It thus appears that even realisation of Brah-

man, if it is to be attained as a permanent blessing, must be based upon and always appended to the cult of Bhakti. And so it is said in the Gītā text—तेषां ज्ञानी नित्ययुक्त एकभक्तिर्विशिष्यते । प्रियो हि ज्ञानिनोऽत्यर्थमहं स च मम प्रियः ॥ (VII, 7), that a follower of the Jñāna cult is loved by Bhagavān only when he is constantly attached and devoted to Him and propitiates Him by constant servitude.

The cult of Bhakti is thus declared not only as superior to the Jñāna mārga but that it frustrates the necessity of taking to the latter as an independent method. It is for this superiority that a-cetics who have attained Release, not being satisfied with that state of realisation, hanker after a still higher pleasure, and to that end begin the process of devotional servitude by way of worshipping the Image of Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa (cf मुक्ता अपि लीलया विग्रहं कृत्वा भजन्ते—Bhagavat Sandarbha). The same idea is also clearly stated in the Gītā texts VII, 1-5 एवं सततयुक्ता ये भक्तास्त्वां पर्युपासते । ये चाप्यक्षरमव्यक्तं तेषां कं योगवित्तमाः ॥ मय्यवेश्य मनो ये मां नित्ययुक्ता उपासते । श्रद्धया पर्योपेतास्ते मे युक्ततमा मताः ॥ ये त्वत्परमनिर्देश्यमव्यक्तं पर्युपासते । सर्वत्रगमविन्यञ्च कूटस्थमचलं ध्रुवम् ॥ संनियम्येन्द्रियग्रामं सर्वत्र समबुद्धयः । ते प्राप्नुवन्ति मामेव सर्वभूतहिते रताः ॥ क्लेशोऽधिकतरस्तेषामव्यक्तासक्तचेतसाम् । अव्यक्ताहि गतिर्दुःखं देहवद्भिरवाप्यते ॥ Irrespectively of any sectarian commentary, the use of the word युक्ततमाः in the above texts clearly shows the excellence of the Bhakti cult and the last verse indicates that the indescribable state of Brahman Jñāna which is almost tantamount to a state of cypher, instead of being a blessing, is rather a source of trouble if it is attained in an independent Jñāna Mārga—trouble

because it is sure to be followed by a downright heavy fall. On this latter point the texts run-जीवन्मुक्ता अपि पुनर्वन्धनं यान्ति कर्मभिः । यद्यविन्यमहाशक्तौ भगवत्पराधिनः ॥ Vāsanā bhāṣya, cited in Bhakti Sandarbha, p 505), and; जीवन्मुक्ताः प्रपद्यन्ते क्वचित् संसारवसनाम् । योगिनो वै न लिप्यन्ते कर्मभिर्भगवत्पराः ॥ (Bhāṣya.)

It is to be distinctly noted here that though the cult of Jñāna independent of Bhakti is to be rejected altogether as a fruitless attempt, yet Vaiṣṇava Philosophy does not ignore the end itself called Release, but says only that it cannot be attained except by means of Bhakti. Thus in the Gītā texts (XIII, 7-11) the state of Release is referred to in the verses अमानि-त्वमदम्भित्वम् etc in the introductory portion; in the middle the Bhakti cult is referred to in the verses मयि चानन्ययोगेन etc; towards the close, again, in the verses एतज्ज्ञानमिति प्रोक्तम् etc is the distinct statement that true Release can be attained only by one following the Bhakti cult.

Yoga mārga: From a careful examination and reconciliation of the various texts of the Gītā, the Bhāgavata, the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, and Patañjali's Yoga Sūtras, we come to know that according to the Svarūpa Lakṣaṇa the word Yoga means चित्तवृत्तिनिरोधः or suppression of the modification of the thinking principle. In other words, the mind, as appears from the Gītā texts, is restless, turbulent, violent, and obstinate; and, on account of co-habitation, the soul, though intrinsically pure and tranquil, has to undergo this state of restlessness; moreover, this is unavoidable because it is all due to the influence of the Māyā Śakti of Bhagvān Himself, which influence the soul is bound to come under owing to its past transgression of forgetfulness of Bhagvān. Thus the mind becomes distracted in various ways, thereby losing its original tranquil state.

To regain the tranquil state, the various modifications of the thinking principle due to the distractions must be suppressed first. This suppression consists of certain practices, viz, the eight ancillaries of Yoga—forbearance, observance, peculiar posture of the body, suppression of the breath, restraint, attention, contemplation and meditation.

In consequence of this suppression of the modifications, there arises a state of the thinking principle, and to describe this state as the effect of the distinctive practices constitutes the *tatastha laksana* of the word Yoga. Thus by *tatastha-laksana* Yoga means that tranquil state of the thinking principle in which, owing to the cessation of all the modifications, it posits its own intrinsic nature as the *chitkara* or a pure bit of the Infinite Bliss of Bhagavān, and thus sees nothing but the One in all and all in One. In this state, all knowledge of difference pertaining to the different objects of the universe being vanquished, there arises a sense of equality in all the different selfs, and the self sees the one pervading Spirit Nārāyaṇa or Īśvara or Paramātmā (as differently styled in the system of Vaiṣṇava Philosophy) every where—in his own heart, as well as in the hearts of all beings of the universe. This state is called the *Asamprajñāta Samādhi*—the highest state in Yoga. And because the self in its intrinsic nature is but a bit of Bhagavān Who is Rasa, it now enjoys eternal bliss or beatitude, in other words, the end or summum bonum called Kaivalya is attained thereby. The word Kaivalya does not signify 'mere liberation' as wrongly interpreted by many, but a state of ecstatic joy consequent upon the liberation of the soul from the fetters of mundane existence. The word is derived from केवल with a suffix in the sense of भाव, and केवल derived from 'क' meaning 'bliss' and the root वल् meaning 'revelling', means 'one that revels in bliss.'

In the above are involved, like the eight āṅgas or members, the three main stages of Yoga as referred to in the Gītā texts. These stages are Yogāruruṅṣu (योगारुरुङ्गु), Yogārūḍha (योगारूढ), and Prāptasiddhi (प्राप्तसिद्धि) . The first stage is that in which a being, whose mind has been purified by the performance of vedic rites, is just initiated into the Yoga mārga. The second is that in which the modification of the thinking principle having been suppressed, the mind is diverted away from all objects of sense and all acts, and entertains no desire of any kind. The last is the stage in which Kaivalya is attained.

It further appears from what is stated above that in realisation according to this cult of Yoga the Ultimate Reality Bhagavān manifests Himself in His partial aspect Paramātmā and because Paramātmā like Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa is Saviśeṣa Brahman, the Yoga mārga is fittingly styled in Vaiṣṇava Religion as one variety of the Bhakti cult. It is more specifically designated as Yoga Miśra or Śānta Bhakti. Evidently a yogi cannot aspire even after the realisation of Paramātmā unless he starts his career with an implicit faith in Bhagavān. This fact is clearly stated in the Gītā text VI, 31 which means that "that Yogi who by way of resorting to a sense of equality in the whole universe, is devoted to Me—the all-pervading One, finds his realisation a lasting one and never strays away from his own intrinsic self—hood and function. We further know from the Bhāg text X, 10-5 that a good number of yogis in the days of yore found their severe austerities all ending in a fuss simply because they lacked in Bhakti.

Relation between the three cults of Jñāna, Yoga and Bhakti. :—

In the first place, between the two cults of Jñāna and Yoga there is similarity inasmuch as both must be appended

to the cult of Bhakti if at all they are to grant their respective summum bonums. Yet there is a good deal of difference; for, while in the realisation according to the Jñāna mārga there arises a merge of the individual soul in the Absolute Self, in the other case there is no such merging and the individual self retains the natural real relation of bhedābheda between itself and Paramātmā. And for this very reason the cult of Yoga leads to a higher stage of realisation than the Jñāna cult, as is quite evident from the Gītā texts in which towards the close Bhagavān Himself while speaking of the highest esoteric teaching of the Bhakti cult, by way of introduction, says—इति ते ज्ञानमाख्यातं गुह्याद् गुह्यतरं मया । विमृश्यैतदशेषेण यथेच्छसि तथा कुरु ॥ (XVIII, 63).

Secondly, from what is stated above we cannot but conclude about the all-surpassing supremacy of the Bhakti cult in the hierarchy of methods of realisation. This excellence of Bhakti we find clearly indicated in the Bhāg. texts न साधयति मां योगो न सांख्यं धर्म उद्धव । न स्वाध्यायस्तपस्त्यागो यथा भक्तिर्ममोर्जिता ॥ (XI, 1419), and

संसारसिन्धुमतिदुस्तरमुत्तिथिषोः

नान्यः प्रबो भगवतः पुरुषोत्तमस्य ।

लीलाकथारसनिषेवनमन्तरेण

पुंसो भवेद् विविधदुःखद्वार्हितस्य ॥ (XII, 4 40).

Nor should it be argued on the basis of the Śruti text—तमेव विदिन्वानिमृत्युमेति (Śvet. III, 8) that Bhakti, though it might be the means for the attainment of supreme pleasure, has not the power of effecting selfrealisation i.e. true knowledge of Brahman; for by constant hearing and citation of the sweetnames and graceful acts of Bhagavān, the mind undoubtedly attains to a state of composure though the ceremonial rites might be shunned completely, and in this pure state of the mind True Knowledge is clearly revealed.

The gradation thus indicated in the stage of realisation between the three cults can be best explained by way of analogy to the descent of the sage Nārada from heaven as described by the poet Māgha in his *Nīlupālavadha*. At first Nārada appeared to observers below as if he were a mere halo of lustre in which were visible no distinctive features of a being; gradually, as he descended more and more, it was perceived as an embodied thing; with more descent and consequent nearness to the observer the different parts of the body were distinctly perceived and then recognised as a human being; and when the object came very near, it was fully recognised as Nārada. Just in the same way, by the practice of the Jñāna cult, owing to the merge of the finite self in the Absolute One, the self gets immersed, so to say, in the illimitable infinite ocean of light—the infinite lustre of Bhagavān, and because the dualism which is the real relation between the finite self and the Absolute is temporarily suspended and also because there is no manifestation of the attributes and powers, it must be regarded as a very low stage, very far away from the summum bonum Prema. Then by Yoga practice the self comes nearer to the highest and in-as-much as at this stage though Bhagavān does not manifest Himself in His fullest display, yet He appears in His aspect of Paramātmā in which there is a partial manifestation of the attributes. The culminating point is reached by the cult of Bhakti.

The comparative excellence, thus stated, of the three cults is clearly expressed in the *Gītā* texts. Thus from the text VI, 46

तपस्विभ्योऽधिको योगी ज्ञानिभ्योऽपि मनोऽधिकः ।

कर्मिभ्यश्चाधिको योगी तस्माद् योगी भवार्जुन ॥

irrespectively of any sectarian commentary, it is apparent on the face of it that a yogi is dearer to Bhagavān than a

follower of the Jñāna cult. Again, from the last śloka of the same chapter

योगिनामपि सर्वेषां मद्गतेनान्तरात्मना ।

श्रद्धावान् भजते यो मां स मे युक्ततमो मतः ॥

it is evident that of all yogis one who is devoted to Bhagavān with a very explicit faith and steadfast adherence is the dearest to Him and is fit for the state of highest bliss.

Relation between the four mārgas:—

This would be briefly indicated if to the above relation we add that the Karma mārga does nothing but prepare a door way for realisation in the cults of Jñāna and Bhakti (including Yoga).

CHAPTER III.

EXCELLENCE OF THE BHAKTI CULT AND JĪVA'S PRONENESS THERETO.

From the relation between Bhakti and the other cults it appears that the former is the best means for religious realisation. This excellent character of Bhakti will be made more conspicuous if we turn our attention to the following important traits:—

1. Sincere faith and devotion alone, irrespective of any earthly qualities, is capable of uplifting one to the highest heaven and contributing to the beatific sports of Bhagavān. The blind orthodoxy and rigour of Hindu Smṛiti texts places a particular class of people—the Brāhmins—in the highest social status and classifies the earthly qualities of these Brahmins into twelve, viz-wealth, respectability, physical beauty, penance, śāstric knowledge, prowess, lustre, influence, strength, energy and intellect, whereas the class of Chanālās, qualified or not, is made to occupy the lowest status in the society and always to be slighted as untouchables. The Bhāg.

texts distinctly lay down that even a Chandāla possessed of sincere faith and devotion is dearer to Bhagavān than a Brahmin endowed with those twelve qualities but sadly lacking in any faith.¹ The text on this point is अहो वन श्वपचोऽतो गरीयान् । याज्जिह्वाग्रे वर्त्तते नाम तुभ्यम् (III, 33, 7). The influence of Bhakti is such that a devotee though devoid of any earthly quality becomes at once more humble and lowly than a blade of grass, patient and forbearing like a tree, never seeks honour from others but gives them all their dues; while its absence is invariably followed by self conceit, hypocrisy and other allied qualities, and thereby vitiates all the twelve qualities mentioned above. Briefly speaking, qualities of the heart are always commendable while those of the understanding attended with egotism are despised in the sphere of religion. Permanent bliss therefore is always coexistent with the former.

2. From the above it follows as a corollary that the cult of Bhakti is accessible to all irrespective of caste, as is evident from the Bhāg text—किरातहृनान्द्रुपुलिन्दपुक्षश आभीरकङ्का यवनाः खलसादयः । येऽन्ये च पापा यदपाश्रयाश्रयाः शुच्यन्ति तस्मै प्रभाविष्णवे नमः ॥ (II, 4, 18). Far be it said of the people belonging to higher castes or nationalities, even the aboriginal tribes—the Kirātas, the Hūnas, the Ābhiras etc, the Yavanas, the Khasas are always welcome to, and purified by, this sectarian and universal religion.

3. It embraces all people irrespective of their outward rites. In this connection we might refer to the significance of the Hindu scriptural texts—the Smritis—in laying down certain injunctions for the observance of formal rites which are technically called Sadāchāra. These practices, I am afraid, are considered by the west as well as by the westernised east as so many superstitions to be ignored altogether, while they

1. See Appendix.

are given an undue importance by too orthodox Hindu minds. Without entering into a detailed examination of this point it will suffice here to state that most of these practices, I mean, those, other than the purely formal etiquettes,¹ relate to physiological changes, and as such should not be ignored altogether in view of the very close relation between the mind and the body. Nor should we accept the blind partiality and fondness oftentimes shown by many towards these rites. Religion, if properly understood, is more a thing of the thought sphere than of the body. As we shall explain fully later on, the cult of Bhakti in its low stage called *Sādhana Bhakti* might lay a considerable stress upon the performance of outward ceremonial rites, but this is rather a stepping stone to the stage of *Rāgānugā* in which there can be an uninterrupted flow of steady remembrance of the beatific sports of Bhagavān. Thus to steer a middle course between the above two extreme views on the point, V. Philosophy asserts that a sincere devotee, even though he might be habituated to defiled practices, is notwithstanding regarded as saintly in the estimation of Bhagavān, as is evident from the Gītā text—अपि चेत् सुदु-राचारी भजते मामनन्यभाक् । साधुरेव स मन्तव्यः सम्यग् व्यवसितो हि सः ॥ (the meaning explained in a previous chapter). Yet by the force of the word अपि here some sort of pre-eminence is given to the condition of strict observance of the recognised purificatory rites. In other words, a compliance with this latter condition is regarded as auxiliary in the speedy attainment of realisation. The real fact however is that a

-
1. Under this head I bring some of those formal rites that are referred to in Mann, ch. IV, e. g., the verse 48 which says—
 “Let a snataka never void feces or urine, facing the wind or a fire or looking towards a Brahmana, the sun, water or cows.”

sincere and earnest devotee is not required to make an effort in observing such rites; the more he advances in his spiritualisation the greater attention he naturally and voluntarily pays to this aspect of the Bhakti cult. Notwithstanding this natural and voluntary inclination, if in some texts an imperative duty is laid down to this effect, the real significance of that injunction is to be understood as a sort of check against the possibility of many inconsiderate beings in being addicted to vices and immoralities.

4. It is alike welcome to lit-rate gentry and to illiterate folk. We are to remember here the great utterance of the famous scientist Pascal—"The heart has reasons which reason can not know". Sincere faith and earnest devotion as characteristics of Bhakti are always the products of the reason dwelling in the heart and not of the head. It matters not, therefore, whether a being is capable or not of a high display of his intellect and understanding so far as the cult of Bhakti is concerned. Besides, the intrinsic potency of the sweetness and beatific sports and graceful acts of Bhagavān is such that it cannot but act upon the mind of a being conscious or unconscious of the meaning thereof. A medicinal herb by reason of its own potency must act upon the organism even if a patient takes it without the least knowledge of its properties; such is the case here also.

5. The being initiated into the Bhakti cult is irrespective of attachment or nonattachment to worldly objects. The potency of Bhakti is quite capable of steadying a man and making him unperturbed even though he might be attached to worldly objects. The mind once begun to be directed towards Bhagavān will by constant practice withdraw from those very objects. The manas is of a very small dimension-atomic in size; it cannot simultaneously be tied to two things; if fixed to Bhagavān, it must not be attached to any other thing. Such

being the case, there is no doubt that a man doing worldly acts without any attachment thereto attains to a state of composition fit for fixture towards God.

6. The Bhakti cult is intended alike for men desirous of release and those that have attained release. That release is a concomitant consequence of Bhakti has already been indicated. The text again **आत्मारामा मुनयो निर्विकल्पाः** etc shows that even released souls hanker after devotion to Bhagavān, nay, even those that are the constant associates in his beatific sports take to Bhakti as their only function. Rādhā has been described as the ideal devotee.

7. The formal ritual or worship prescribed in the Bhakti cult is not restricted to the dedication of particular varieties of things and acts, but applies to all things and acts irrespective of quality or quantity. This appears from the Gītā texts—

पत्रं पुष्पं फलं तोयं यो मे भक्त्या प्रयच्छति ।

तदहं भक्त्युपहृतमश्नामि प्रयतात्मनः ॥ (IX, 26)

-- I (Bhagavān) accept any thing and everything--be it a leaf, a flower, a fruit or a quantity of water--if it is given with sincere faith and devotion : **यत् करोषि यदश्नासि यज्जुहोसि ददासि यत् । यत्तपस्यसि कौन्तेय तत् कुरुष्व मदर्पणम् ॥ (IX, 27)** "Dedicate all your acts to me, O Kownteaya, your doing, your eating, your sacrificing, your gift, your penance and the like.

8. Bhakti is compatible with whatever motive a devotee might have in view. It is equally practicable if one begins without any desire for mundane effects, with such a desire, or with a desire for release. The only thing necessary is faith; and if with that faith in mind one desires earthly prosperity or fame or learning or anything of the kind, his desires will be fulfilled. Bhagavān being the source of the entire creation, if propitiated with devotion He can fulfill all desires irrespec-

tive of their nature. Besides, such desires can be fulfilled at all times under all circumstances and in all places.

9. It is the best safe-guard against all kinds of evils and difficulties besetting a man thereby enabling him to make an unhampered, glorious and happy career in the arena of worldly affairs. In the primary stage called Sādhana Bhakti, an individual being, though possessed of a sincere faith, has indeed to go through a series of struggles for existence and to go on with the daily routine of duties in the midst of a diversity of environments; and, as proved by our ordinary experience, there is every possibility of meeting with rebuffs, despondency, troubles and fear; but the very fact of steadfast adherence to Bhagavān, without causing any the least affectation of his mind, holds him up and enables him to prove an enviable success in the sphere of worldly affairs.

10. It has the unique power of counter-acting sinful acts. Of such acts there are two kinds, viz.—those that are sure to produce effects but have not yet begun to do so—technically called aprārabdha Karma; and those that have produced actual effects—called Prārabdha Karma. Such producibility and actual production are all guided by the doctrine of Karman. As to the former the Bhāg. text says—यथान्निःसुसमिद्धार्चिःकरोत्येधांसि भस्मसात् । तथा मद्विषया भक्तिरुद्धैर्नांसि कृत्स्नशः ॥ (XI, 14, 19.)

“Devotion to me entirely counter-acts all sins just in the same way as fire kindled for the purpose of cooking burns fuels to ashes.” As to the latter we may refer to the text—

अहो वत श्वपचोऽनो गरीयान् यज्जिह्वाग्रे वर्तते नाम तुभ्यम्
तेपुस्तपस्ते जुहुवुः सस्तुगार्ह्या ब्रह्मानर्चुर्नाम गृणन्ति ये ते ॥

(III, 33, 7) “Even one belonging to the lowest cast, Chandala who is always uttering the sweet names of Bhagavān is to be considered as a superior being for that very fact. Such utter-

rance of the names of Bhagavān is superior to penance etc., for it gives the effects of penance as well as something more; hence one always acting such, be he a Chāṇḍāla, is superior to Brahmanas devoid of devotion—of whatever severe asceticism the latter might be. It also counteracts physical diseases due to sinful acts done in previous existences.

If therefore Bhakti, as described above, is such an excellent means of realisation, there can be no doubt that this should be adopted by one desirous of permanent supreme happiness. But, as we have seen, some Jīvas are from beginningless time averse to their own natural function of contiguity to Bhagavān; and if that function is to be posited again, the Jīva thus committing a transgression must be made to be inclined to this devotional cult at some particular point of time. The initiation, in other words, into this particular cult of religion must begin in order to result at last in final realisation. The question therefore is—How can such start be effected? What is the origin of the Jīva's proneness to Bhakti? To answer this question we are to remember in the first place the great maxim of Hindu religion—

**नकोऽप्रतिष्ठः श्रुतयो विभिन्ना नासावृषिर्यस्य मतं न भिन्नम्
धर्मस्य तत्त्वं निहितं गुहायां महाजनो येन गतः स पन्थाः ॥**

(quoted by Jīva Goswāmī in his Bhakti Sandarbha)
The maxim means—"As regards the truth of the means of religion, we cannot say it is based upon argumentation for reasoning is ill-founded having no finality; nor is it based merely upon scriptural texts, for these texts are diverse: neither can it be said to be declared by Rsis, for they do not agree with one another. Thus this truth is a much concealed secret to be adopted according as it was practised by a realiser in the past". In other words, the fact that a particular indi-

vidual being takes recourse to a particular method of realisation depends altogether upon his contact with people of saintly character, who having already acquired a spiritual insight and attained concrete realisation are more capable of influencing others than a legion of precepts laid down in the Śāstras.

But to say thus is not to state the whole truth. Others there are who assert not a less plausible theory, viz, that the starting point in the sphere of practical demonstration in religion depends upon the grace and goodness of Bhagavān. Indeed the grace of the all-merciful Being is the primary cause of the Jiva's contiguity to Bhagavān being posited; but this primary causality, it is here to be distinctly noted, does not and cannot operate directly with regard to those beings that by reason of their averseness to Bhagavān have plunged themselves into the illimitable ocean of the miseries of mundane existence. Now what is the psychological import of 'grace' or 'kindness'? It is nothing but a change arising within one's mental principle when affected by a feeling of the sorrow of other phenomenal beings. But since the sorrow of phenomenal beings is a product of the Tamas, a constituent of Prakṛti, and because the Highest Mind of the Highest Being Bhagavān whose sole attribute is supreme bliss is absolutely unaffected by Prakṛti (the two being contradictories like light and darkness), the grace or kindness thus described cannot possibly arise within the mind of Bhagavān. Consequently, there is no hope, from this point of view, of the miseries of those beings being put an end to, although the Highest Being is ever existent as capable of doing, undoing or doing otherwise any-thing and every thing at his own sweet will. If, again, we consider the point of view of the kindness of saintly people, it will appear that although these beings are at this stage unaffected by mundane troubles and miseries, yet a thought of their

previous state of miseries now and then peeps into their mind, that is to say, they occasionally remember their previous miseries just in the same way as one waking after a dreamy sleep remembers the imaginary sorrow taking place in his dream. Hence it is not improbable that these saintly people feel compassion at the miseries of phenomenal beings. Still it must be admitted that they have not the direct power of removing their miseries because the miseries are not originated by them. The most successful way of removing a thing is by the agency of one whose power has produced the thing; in other words, the miseries can be put an end to only by a potency of Bhagavān whose potency in another shape plays an important part in the causation of those miseries.

We are thus placed in a fix about the point at issue. The only solution of this very knotty point in philosophy so skilfully arrived at by ancient Vaisṇava savants is this—The causality of the grace of Bhagavān operates upon an individual being not directly but in association with that aspect of the being's Bhakti which consists in a thought that "This or that saintly person is my only resort capable of uplifting me from this miserable state". The same idea might be put in another way thus—the grace and kindness of Bhagavān, which is always enjoyed by a released saintly being, is bestowed upon a miserable individual through the medium of the association and kindness of that released soul. And because Bhakti has also been defined as the bliss potency of Bhagavān that eternally flows in current between Himself and His associates—the released souls, we might conclude by saying that the first initiation into the cult of Bhakti is due to the goodness of Bhakti itself (भक्तिरूपा हि केवलम्). The operation of this grace-causality of Bhagavān through the medium of the goodness of saints is clearly referred to in Bhāg texts—

ज्ञानं विशुद्धं परमार्थमेकमनन्तरं त्ववहिर्ब्रह्म सत्यम् ।

प्रत्यक् प्रशान्तं भगवच्छब्दसंज्ञं यद्वासुदेवं कवयो वदन्ति ॥

रूढगणैतत्तपसा न याति न चेज्यया निर्वपणाद् गृहाद्वा ।

न छन्दसा नैव जलाग्निसूर्यैर्विना महत्पादरजोभिषेकम् ॥

(V, 12, 11-12)

The first verse relates to Vasudeva as the Absolute Being, and the second one means that an inclination towards the devotional worship of this Being is effected only by the grace of the good and great, and not by anything else—penance, sacrificial rite, distribution of wealth, repetition of vedic mantras or the like.

The genial and kind influence of saintly people thus plays an important part in one's practical demonstration in the sphere of the Bhakti cult. The question now is, who are these saints and what are their distinctive characteristics? This question is a very vital one. Debauchery in religion which is very prevalent in all climes is mainly caused by the want of a judicious selection of guides. And owing to this serious defect most of the present followers of the very sublime religion of the Vaisnavas have under-gone such a degree of degeneration that the religion itself has now become the buttend of ridicule and caviling. As a set off against this very pitiable state of things it is meet indeed to discuss this point at full length.

On this point we might refer in the first place to the Bhāg. texts—

महान्तस्ते समचित्ताः प्रशान्ता विमन्यवः सुहृदः साधवो ये ।

ये वा मयीशे कृतमौहृदार्था जनेषु देहम्भरवार्त्तिकेषु ।

गृहेषु जायात्मजरातिमत्सु न प्रीतियुक्ता यावदर्थश्च लोके ॥

(V, 5, 2-3).

The first line describes some of the characteristics of saints that have realised Brahman as a non-differenced Substance,

viz, that their mental state is one of tranquility and composure, they are equally inclined to all beings, devoid of anger and similar other passions, they are friendly to all. The last two lines give an account of those saints who have attained a realisation of the concept of Bhagavān and who therefore, besides the characteristics of the former class, possess the following, viz, that by way of attaining a very high degree of realisation in the cult of devotion they stand to Bhagavān in one of the loving relationships already described, that all their love devoid of the slightest tinge of sensuality is solely directed to Bhagavān alone, and that they require only that amount of wealth which is barely necessary for carrying on the function of devotional worship. There is no doubt that this latter class of saints is referred to in its bearing upon an influence upon a phenomenal being desirous of realisation in the cult of Bhakti. To explain further, these Bhāgavata saints are to be distinguished from others of the same general type, viz, from those who, reaching a stage far above the stage of release, have by sheer force of their devotional intensity included themselves in the class of constant associates of Bhagavān in His beatific sports. These latter beings, thenceforth regarded as the eternal associates of God in his Highest-Heaven, are never expected to be placed again in the midst of phenomenal beings, and hence they are not in a position to influence a particular individual in the matter of religion. A being of the phenomenal world can possibly come in contact with a saint who for the sole purpose of doing good to others is living in this world.

Of the two kinds of saints referred to in the above verses, V. Philosophy has drawn out an exhaustive classification. To enter into a detailed examination of this topic will not be allowed by the limited scope of the present treatise. It will suffice here to state that a saint of the Bhāgavata type whose

contact of influence is indispensably necessary for inclining a particular individual to the cult of Bhakti must possess the following amongst other distinctive characteristics:—(1) With his mind wholly engrossed with the thought of Bhagavān he should look upon others as of the same nature, in other words, in the language of Hegel, he should see One in all and all in One; (2) though performing all the ordinary functions in a worldly life he should be devoid of attachment or averseness to worldly objects, in other words, he should have really realised the fact that the world is all a transitory thing created by the Māyā Śakti and as such should not be enjoyed with blind attachment; (3) his steady remembrance of the sweet names and graceful beatific sports of Bhagavān should be such that the various troubles of mundane existence, viz, birth decay, hunger, thirst, fear and the like—all relating to the body and the senses—should never be inclined to do any act with the desire for attaining its fruits, and hence should have no chance of being fettered again with the ties of mundane existence; (4) he should be kindhearted, non-jealous, forbearing, patient, truthful, of unblemished character, impartial to all, with the spirit of rendering service to all, devoid of passions, with his senses controlled, pure-minded as well as pure-bodied, with no desire to take part in the various activities of public life, of measured speech and meal, calm and quiet, not careless, grave in nature, not seeking self-respect but respecting all, capable of helping others in understanding the true meaning of religion, non-cheater, perfectly learned in the Śāstras. Such indeed are the insignia essentialia of a true saint of the Bhāgavata type upon whom wholly depends the life of many a being—the life consisting in the blissful activity towards the bliss sports of Bhagavān. If now we contrast with this the type of a spiritual guide we come across in the pre-

sent day, what do we find ? It is nothing but a class of impostors—renegades to the universal religion, pests of the society, evils to the community, thorns of the country, undesirables to the world—travelling in the world under the garb of religion always displaying the flag of virtue, ever covetous, full of hypocrisy, forgery and purgery, intent on doing injury, detractors from the merits of all men, having always committed sins hiding their sins under the pretext of a vow, and deceiving mostly women and illiterate folk. Oh alas ! from what height into what pit fallen ! Drink deep, or taste not the pyrennial spring.

Thus we establish at length the necessity of a spiritual guide in the sphere of religion. Indeed those vain rationalistic thinkers of the west who regard the Absolute as comprehensible by reasoning and understanding may do away with this necessity ; but an inevitable consequence of this reliance upon human understanding is to recede and receive a hopeless downfall after reaching some degree of height in the horizon of intellect, and, like Spencer and others, these proud philosophers will at last rest satisfied with the feminine consolation that the Absolute is Unknowable. From the point of view of our theory of religion, on the other hand, the Absolute is un-knowable by means of argumentation as is distinctly stated in the texts *यतो वाचो निवर्त्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह* (Tait. II, 4, 1, also II, 9, 1), *नैवा तर्केण मतिरापनेया* (Katha II, 9); and yet the Absolute is knowable by the grace of Bhakti alone. So the Śruti further says *यत् त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत् तत् केन कं पश्येत्.....तत् केन कं विजानीयात् येनेदं सर्वं विजानाति तं केन विजानीयात्* (Vṛh IV, 5, 15) which evidently means that nothing of the universe, no bit of knowledge prevailing in the universe, can independently know the Absolute since the universe itself has its own reality and knowledge entirely based upon the reality and knowledge of the Absolute.

A more positive and definite statement we find in the text **नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यो न मेधया न बहुना श्रुतेन, यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्यः तस्यैव वृणुते तनूं स्वाम्** (Kāthā. I, 2, 22) "This-the Highest Self-is not to be gained by means of reasoning however forcible it might be, nor by any amount of memory and retentive power, nor by a scholastic study of the vedas; He is to be gained by him alone whom He favours, and to him He sells off own body". The Absolute thus is knowable by nothing short of his own grace, which grace how ver operates through the medium of a spiritual guide as is well said in the scriptural texts—**आचार्यः पूर्वरूपम्** (Tait. I, 3, 2), **आचार्यद्वैव विद्या विदिता साधिष्ठं प्रापयति** (Chhā IV. 9, 3), **आचार्यवान् पुरुषो वेद** (Chhā. VI, 14, 2), **अतएव तद्विज्ञानार्थं स गुरुमेवाभिगच्छेत्** (Mund. 1, 2, 12), **नैषा तर्केण मतिगपनेया प्रोक्तान्येनैव सुज्ञानाय प्रेष्ठा** (Kāth. II, 9), **यस्य देवं पराभङ्गिर्यथा देवे तथा गुरौ । तस्यैते कथिता ह्यर्थाः प्रकाशन्ते महात्मनः ॥** (Śvet VI 23), **गुरुपदिष्टमार्गेण**

ध्यायन् मदगुणमव्ययम् । मत्सायुज्यं द्विजः सम्यग भजेत् भ्रमरकीटवत् (Mukti. I, 24) "A spiritual guide is the previous symptom; true knowledge gained from the spiritual guide makes one attain the highest good; one having got a spiritual guide knows the Highest Self, hence, for the knowledge of that (Brahman) he (the individual soul) should approach a spiritual guide: this mentality (towards Brahman) is not to be gained by reasoning, but, when unfolded by another (evidently meaning a spiritual guide), it is best suited to yield the highest knowledge: these instructions given about the High-souled One are realised by him a one who has devotion alike to the Self-luminous Divinity and to the spiritual guide, a Brahmin can attain Sāyujya Mukti only by way of meditating upon my underlying attributes in the way indicated by a spiritual guide."

Such being the high position of a spiritual guide, the fact cannot be gainsaid that such a being should be looked upon as a divinity and honoured and worshipped with the best of one's ability and attention. To honour him is no doubt to obey him and act according to his instructions. But the question is, "Is this duty of obeying him to be understood as a categorical imperative in the Kantian sense, or as subject to certain limitations"? Some are of opinion—the poet Kālidāsa included—that the commandments of a guide should be obeyed without any argumentation whatsoever (आज्ञा गुरुणा ह्यविचारणीया Kālidāsa's Raghuvamśa). But the view of V. Philosophy on this point seems to be a little different. If the above-mentioned characteristics are all present in a guide, the truth of the former view is of course undisputed; and in such cases even the slightest hesitation in obeying would amount to a serious transgression, the simple reason being that such a guide can never do a wrong. If, on the other hand, a guide be not of this ideal type, but almost tantamount to one of the modern type, there are great doubts as to the propriety of such a categorical imperative. The scriptural text distinctly lays down that 'a spiritual guide who is full of vanity and self-conceit, is a pedagogue, with no real knowledge of the duties in the path of religion, who himself by his acts and conduct has deviated from the path of rectitude and thereby proved quite unfit for this most responsible position—such a so called guide must be avoided altogether' (et. गुरोरप्यवलितस्य कार्याकार्यमज्ञानतः । उत्पथप्रतिपन्नस्य परित्यागो विधीयते ॥) The best solution of this important point at issue can be thus stated in the language of the late lamented illustrious saint Narottama Thākura—

Sādhu Sāstra guru vākya hīdaye kariyā nīkya

Satata bhāsiva prema-mājhā.

(Prema bhakti chandrīkā, 12).

The words of a spiritual guide are to be accepted only when they are in agreement with the utterances of saints, the statements in the scriptural texts and the dictates of one's own conscience. This noble aphorism, though crisp and concise, contains in a nutshell, as it were, the whole body of truths of this nature laid down in the various theological treatises of the east and west, and as such should serve as a motto to all seekers after truth.

✓ CHAPTER IV.

Two stages of Bhakti-(a) Injunctory, (b) Rāgānugā or the flowing current of devotion.

The cult of Bhakti thus established in various ways admits of two main stages, viz, (1) the primary or lower stage called Vaidhī or Injunctory Bhakti, (2) the higher stage called Rāgānugā or the flowing current of devotion.

Injunctory Bhākti:—

It is that which is practised under the sole guidance of the injunctions laid down in the scriptural texts. Passionate attachment to God-that spontaneous flow of devotion which evolves from the heart in an easy voluntary way-cannot indeed be gained at the very outset of religious speculation. Yet the mind which is acted upon by two opposite forces-the force of faith in the Absolute Being which draws the mind towards the Absolute, and the force of the Māyā Śakti which draws it away from the same Absolute-does practise the devotional functions in strict accordance with the tenets of the Śāstras even though the latter might not be wholly relishing to the mind for the time being. A pill of quinine must be taken for scaring away malaria however bitter and unpalatable it might be. These injunctions again are of two kinds. Some have the force of causing the being's inclination to-

wards the devotional cult; others relate primarily to formal rites of worship, fastings, pāñances and the like—all which have the power of steadying the inclination and accumulating thoughts towards the devotion.

The principal elements in this Injunctory Bhakti are (1) Śaraṇāpatti, (2) Worshipping and honouring one's spiritual guide and other saints, (3) Śravaṇa (4) Kīrtana, (5) Smarana (6) Pādasevana, (7) Archana, (8) Vandana (9) Dāśya (10) Sakhyā, and (11) Ātmanivedana. (1) Śaraṇāpatti :—This consists in the mind's resorting to Bhagavān as the only stay in life with the thought that there is no other alternative. This thought again arises in two ways, viz,—by way of an original conviction that there is nothing to afford permanent happiness, or by way of forsaking something already adopted unwisely as the source of happiness (e. g. the act of taking to Kṛṣṇa as the highest source of pleasure by way of avoiding all sacraments in the Vedas on the authority of the Gītā text सर्वधर्मान् परित्यज्य मामेकं शरणं व्रज । अहं त्वां सर्वपापेभ्यो मोक्षयिष्यामि मा शुचः" ॥ XVIII, 66—"Forsaking all sacraments resort to Me alone; I shall save you from all sorts of transgression; do not grieve.")

This resignatory function of the mind giving rise to a complex concept has been thus analysed into six constituent ideas, viz— (1) आनुकूलस्य संकल्पः (2) प्रातिकूल्यविवर्जनम् ।

रक्षिष्यतीति (3) विश्वासो (4) गोप्तृत्वे वरणं तथा ॥

(5) आत्मीनेक्षप (6) कार्पण्ये पङ्क्तिविधा शरणागतिः ॥

Of these the fourth is the primary idea and the others are secondary following necessarily from the fourth. Etymologically it means the same as Śaraṇāgati. If the conviction is once settled upon the mind that Bhagavān is the only stay—the final support of all beings, the individual will think only of such things as are congenial to the concept of Bhagavān will

think of its own natural functions contributing to the supreme pleasure of Bhagavān (अनुकूल्यस्य संकल्पः), and will thus be averse to all things contradictory to the concept (प्रातिकूल्य विवर्जनम्). There will also arise the belief that and the final support Bhagavān is sure to save him at all times under all circumstances; hence all fear, all hesitation, all uneasiness in the performance of ordinary functions in life will be removed altogether (रक्षिष्यतीति विश्वासः). As a result thereof the thought will arise that to whatever acts the mind might be directed, the inclination is caused by the allsurpassing impetus given by the potency of Bhagavān residing as the Immanent Regulator in the heart of all beings (आत्मनिक्षेप or resignation of the self). Finally, as an inkling of a hankering after the grace of Bhagavān, the thought will arise in the shape of underrating one's own self as a being to be much pitied because of the grace of God not forthcoming (कार्पण्य). (2)

The Śaraṇāpatti function of the mind is indeed highly efficacious inasmuch as it lies at the root of all religion. But the tree of realisation can not grow and develop unless the root is deepseated and firmly footed. For this purpose the next step required is to serve with earnest devotion the spiritual guide and all other saints and expounders of the truths of religion. These are the beings that have attained actual realisation of truths, and hence their contact and influence helps a great deal in the matter of steadying and safeguarding the preliminary faith in the Absolute. (3). By Śrāvana is meant the hearing of the sweet names, supersensuous beauty and beatific sports of Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa, as described in the scriptural texts. The significance of this lies in the fact that it demands upon more time and attention in religious speculation than the set formulae and lip prayers require us to do.

(4) The above things when chaunted loudly in sweet

quorum goes by the name of Kirtana. This function is more powerful than the above in effecting successfully the devotional bent of the mind. The Bhāg. texts mention a good number of instances in which even realisers in the Jñāna and other mārgas took to this method for the purpose of attaining Bhakti. Moreover, in the Kali age when owing to the influence of the involution of time men's span of life is shortened, intellect vitiated and minds full of evil thoughts—the whole atmosphere is surcharged with forgery and purgery, it is not possible to concentrate oneself to the practices of penances and the like (XII, 3, 44); and those very dharmas are replaced by this more effective method; cf.—

कृते यद्ध्ययतो विष्णुं त्रेतायां यजतो मखैः ।

द्वापरे परिचर्यायां कलौ तद्भिरकीर्त्तनान् ॥ (Bhāg. XII, 3, 44).

Besides, the practice of this method is not subject to any restrictions of time, place etc. as the ceremonial rites of worship are.

(5). Remembrance :—The above two functions leave traces in the mental principle in the shape of ideas. These ideas, again, if they are to be reduced to that intensity of thought which results in actual sight of Bhagavān, must be attended to, otherwise they will be thrown into the background to be deposited as subconscious states of the mind. ✓ Thus we get at the next step called Remembrance which, generally speaking, consists in the attention being directed towards ideas and percepts. This remembrance, which is appropriately described as the life of the mind, is the most essential factor inasmuch as by this process the mind being withdrawn from the sphere of not-self is wholly engaged in thinking of the things present within its own sphere; and consequently, the more such processes are carried on the greater possibility there is of the final result the sight of God-being attained. Remembrance, again, has been classified in V. Philosophy into

five kinds or rather five stages, viz, स्मरणमात्र, धारणा, ध्यान, ध्रुवानुस्मृति and समाधि . The first consists in the attention of the mental principle being directed to some percept or idea in a vague and indefinite way. In its present bearing upon the Bhakti cult, it means "to think of Nārāyaṇa as the Absolute Lord in any way however vague and indefinite it might be". At this stage the thinking process is a momentary one, and does not swallow up the whole concept of the Absolute. The second consist in directing the mind to Bhagavān by way of withdrawing it from all phenomenal objects, and consequently the thinking function here lasts for more time than in the first stage. The third means 'to think of the Absolute Bhagavān with special reference to His supreme beauty and the like'; in this case, the nature of the percepts is such that it cannot but occupy the mind for a considerable period of time, and consequently the thought process lasts long. The fourth means steady remembrance in an uninterrupted flow like a stream of nectar or a flow of oil¹ The last

-
1. It is to be noted here that Ramanuja makes no distinction between the two stages of Dhyana and Dhrubasmṛti, as appears from his statement—**ध्यानञ्च तैलधारा वदविच्छिन्न-**

स्मृतिसन्तानरूपा ध्रुवा स्मृतिः (Durgacharana Samkhya-Vedanta Tirtha's Edition of Sri Bhāṣya p. 24). At any

rate, however, according to all, the distinctive character of Dhruba-Smṛti remains the same, viz.—that the flow of remembrance must be uninterrupted like a flow of oil; and this is also the view of Patanjali who defines Dhyana as

तत्र प्रत्ययैकतानता ध्यानम् in which the expression—**प्रत्ययैक तानता**

means that the concentration is so

very intensive that there is not the least intervention of any other thought. It is further to be noted that such intensity of thought as characterises Dhyana or Dhrubasmṛti is almost tantamount to actual sight, as is well said by Ramanuja in

stage called Samādhi consists in the exclusive appearance of the object of thought in the mental principle. Owing to the very great intensity of thought, the mind is wholly engrossed in the thought of Bhagavān and cannot be distracted even by means of very vivid percepts of other kinds. This Samādhi, however, is to be carefully distinguished from the Asampraj-ñāta Brahman-Samādhi, in-as-much as, in the latter the self is completely merged in Brahman having lost its own individuality, where-as in the former the self retaining its own individuality is alone present before Bhagavān there being no intervention of any kind whatsoever.

(6), (7) (8). The next three element consists of certain technical rites of worship; and, since on the basis of the Śruti text पादोऽस्य सर्वा भूतानि त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि (Chhā. III 12, 6) the word पाद here is to be understood in the sense of three quarters, i.e. all the immortal regions of super-sensuous heaven other than the phenomenal world, the element of पादसेवा also includes all such rites as 'residence in sacred places' and 'bath in holy water.' These latter acts, as has already been explained, are necessary in-as-much as they afford opportunities for association with beings of saintly character and with true realisers of the truths of religion. The element of अर्चन or worship proper is intended principally for men of affluence and high position. Non-performance of such acts on the part of the wealthy means only the abuse of wealth and resources, and performance by proxy is nothing but a mockery in religion. If the significance of such rites of worship towards Bhagavān is rightly understood, it does away with the necessity of doing those rites of wor-

the lines—सा च स्मृतिर्दर्शनसमानाकारा; भवति च स्मृतेर्भा-
चनाप्रकर्षाद् दर्शनरूपता (Ibid). This point has already been referred to.

ship towards Bhagavān is rightly understood, it does away with the necessity of doing those rites of worship to smaller deities which are laid down in the Karmakāṇḍa of the vedas.

४. By दास्य which comes next in order is meant servitude. This follows necessarily from the very nature of the relation between Bhagavān and Jiva. Indeed the concept of दास्य is so very important in the Bhakti cult that it lies as an underlying principle in all other forms of devotional practice based upon the various personal relationships¹, and is such that it alone is capable of uplifting one in religious status, as is well said in the bhāg. text—यन्नामश्रुतिमात्रेण पुमान् भवति निर्मलः । तस्य तीर्थपदं किं वा दाम्नानामवशिष्यते ॥ IX, 5, 16. From the very nature of such thought it follows again that a growing intensity of this sense of servitude goes pari passu with greater and greater hankering after realisation. This important concept of servitude, which is principally understood with reference to Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa, implies for that very reason a sense of inferiority and servitude to all beings in an equal and impartial degree, and as such it transcends the two important characteristics of equality and universal brotherhood which are the inevitable consequences of devotion to Bhagavān as Paramātmā.

10. The next higher stage is स्वहय. Its superiority over दास्य has already been indicated in detail.

11. By constant meditation in the lines indicated above

1. From many bhag. texts, e. g., त्वत्सुन्दरस्मितनिरीक्षण.....

...देहि दास्यम्, दत्ताभयञ्च.....भवाम दास्यः, तन्नो निधेहि

.....किंकरीणाम् (X, 29), it appears that the idea of servitude underlies even the devotional love of the Gopis who occupy the highest place in the hierarchy of love demonstrations towards Kṛṣṇa.

the devotee realises the fact that he is solely intended for nothing but devotional worship and servitude to Bhagavān. In other words, he arrives at a stage in which he is capable of complete resignation to God. Such complete resignation is called Ātmanivedana. It is the stage in which the devotee thinks that whatever functions his self, his mind, his senses, his body have to perform are all intended for the sake of Bhagavān.

The various constituent elements of injunctory Bhakti described above are to be regarded not as independent factors but related to one another in-as-much as each of them contributes its mite to the same eternally flowing current of Bhakti. This close relationship is not at all affected by the fact that all these elements together are not practised by all. Our own experience shows that some practise this or that element while others are attached to all combined. Such difference in practice is caused by the difference in mentality between different individual beings :

As the very name indicates, the practice of Injunctory Bhakti is solely guided by injunctions laid down in the scriptures. As such, Bhakti at this stage is a conditional one, and the fear of transgression lying at the root gives the required impetus. But when there is fear entertained the practice of devotion, however voluminous and intensive it might be, cannot be regarded as an easy flow coming out spontaneously from the mind ; whereas the fact is that but for such an easy flow of current of devotion the summumbonum cannot be attained. Hence we are led to a consideration of the higher stage of Bhakti called Rāgānugā.

Rāgānugā, or the Flowing Current of Devotion :—

By Rāgānugā Bhakti is meant that devotion which follows the lines of the Rāgātmikā bhakti eternally displayed in the

supersensuous heaven by the Divinities of the bliss attributes towards Bhagavān Himself. For the meaning of Rāgānugā Bhakti therefore it is necessary to explain the meaning of Rāgātmikā. Now what is Rāga? Broadly speaking, by Rāga is meant the natural flow of desire for, or spontaneous inclination towards, the enjoyment by a self or subject of the contact of its own not-self or object. To illustrate, the senses of sight etc. are naturally directed towards beauty and the like. From the very constitution it follows as a matter of necessity that the sense of sight always comes in contact with a form or beauty, the sense of hearing with a sound, the tactual sense with a skin, the sense of smell with a smell, the sense of taste with a rasa: it is never found that the sense of sight comes in contact with smell, the sense of hearing with a sound, or the like. Whether the self wills or not, the five different sense organs cannot but come in contact with the five objects respectively. If the organism is in a normal state, such contact between a sense and its own object is sure to take place irrespectively of any influence or impetus (the main regulating force of the soul being of course always implied). Similarly, the various Divinities of the bliss attributes of Bhagavān, whose body, senses, mind etc. are all made up of pure bliss, cannot but be attracted towards Bhagavān, cannot but contribute to the eternal ecstatic sports of Bhagavān. Within these Divinities the only desire that can naturally take place is for contributing to the devotional joy towards Bhagavān. For this spontaneous flow of devotion, the only condition is that they are the presiding deities of the bliss attributes of Bhagavān, and no other condition is present.

It thus appears that infinite bliss or Rasa is enjoyed by Bhagavān and made to be enjoyed by the Divinities through the instrumentality of the latter. This enjoyment, though the same in the wide sense in so far as it is enjoyment of sup-

reme pleasure, takes place in different ways owing to the difference in the bliss potencies of Bhagavān. In other words one and the same Infinite Rasa, which necessarily consists of a harmonious combination of different kinds of rasa, being reflected in the hearts of the different Divinites, appears differently owing to the difference in the mentality of those Divinities. By way of analogy we may refer to the concept of sensuous rasa as explained in the Hindu Medical Science. Thus we find in the Charaka Saṁhita—सौम्याः खलु आपोऽन्तरीक्षप्रभवाः प्रकृति-शीता लघ्वश्च अग्न्यङ्गरसाश्च, तास्त्वन्तरीक्षाद् भ्रश्यमानाः अप्राश्च पञ्चमहाभूतगुणसमन्विताः जङ्गमस्थावराणां भूतानां मूर्त्तिरभिप्राणयन्ति, यासु मूर्त्तिषु षडभिर्मूर्च्छन्ति रसाः । (Harinātha Viśāra-da's edition, p. 378). The origin of sensuous rasa is rainwater. But rain-water in this original state is something having no taste, whereas the sixfold rasas-Madhura, Amla, Lavaṇa, Kaṭu, Tikta and Kaṣāya are attributes that can be made known and distinguished only through the instrumentality of the sense of taste. It must be admitted therefore that in the original substance rainwater all the sixfold rasas inhere in a nonmanifest, subtle and indistinguishable state. When that rainwater fallen from the sky mixes with the different movable and immovable substances on the surface of the earth, it appears differently through the medium of the different terrestrial objects, and these different manifestations of one and the same substance rainwater have been classified into the six rasas mentioned above—viz—as sweet in substances like milk etc as sour in Āmalakī, as salty in some of the vegetables, as pungent in pepper, as bitter in Gulāñcha and as astringent in Haritakī. Thus the difference in the six-fold rasas is caused by the different substances imbib-

ing one and the same original source. Similarly, Bhagavān is the Highest Substance consisting of infinite supersensuous Rasa. Though this infinite Rasa is the eternal fountain-head of an infinite number of varieties of supreme pleasure, yet in it the varieties exist in a subtle nonmanifest and indistinguishable state; and, when displayed by the various Divinities of His bliss potencies, the same Infinite Rasa, though one and the same in this original state, appears differently through the medium of the hearts of those Divinities. These diversities of Rasa have been classified by Vaiṣṇava Philosophy into the fourfold supersensuous emotional feelings styled here Dāśya, Sakhya, Vātsalya, and Madhura or Kāntā. Accordingly, the different ways in which those Divinities perform their respective natural functions of devotion are these four. Besides these four, there is another called Śānta Bhakti which is to be distinguished from the four in-as-much as this is directed towards Bhagavān as Paramātmā while the four to Bhagavān as such. Thus we get five stages. Of these, the four methods of Bhakti which are nothing but four gradations in the hierarchy of the manifestations of devotional love towards Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa have already been described as those in which four kinds of personal relationship are brought about.

Besides what we have already said on this point, we might indicate briefly their distinctive characteristics and differentia. From the Bhāg. text शमो मन्निष्ठताबुद्धिः etc. (XI, 19, 36) we know that the word शम means 'unchangeable attachment to Bhagavān' which arises when the mind attains to a state of composure as referred to in the Gītā text ब्रह्मभूतः प्रसन्नात्मा etc. This, therefore, is the only main characteristic of Śānta Bhakti. The weak point here, however, is that the devotion is not based upon an idea of a personal relationship.

These devotees, though following the cult of Bhakti, are desirous of Release as self-realisation and conceive of Bhagavān as the Absolute and Immanent Regulator consisting of Bliss and Knowledge and hence such mode of devotion is also styled Jñānamīrā bhakti. The function of devotion is based for the first time upon a personal relationship in the stage Dāsya bhakti. Here on account of the personal relationship the volume of devotional practice or servitude to Bhagavān is greater than in the above, and consequently this Dāsya bhakti has got one more feature, viz, servitude based upon a relationship (between a master and his servant) in addition to the characteristic of Śānta bhakti. Similarly, the difference of the next higher stage Sakhya is the concept of a friendly relationship between Bhagavān and the devotee, that of Vātsalya is the concept of an affectionate relationship followed by a desire to chide and rebuke so as to nurture the child-like Kṛṣṇa, that of Madhura is the absolute want of hesitation and conventionality which is co-extensive with complete suppression of lordship by graceful charm. The last is the highest stage as already explained, and reaches the climax in the ideal devotion of Rādhā. Briefly speaking, therefore, the characteristic of Śānta Bhakti is one, of Dāsya two, Sakhya three, Vātsalya four, Madhura five; and this gradation in the number of attributes is similar to that in the case of the attributes of the five elements ākāśa and others.

Notwithstanding the delicate points of difference between the five stages, there is one thing common to them, viz, that the devotion in all the cases follows as a natural easy flow irrespective of any impetus given by scriptural texts. Such intensity of feeling is called Rāga, and the method of devotion proceeding therefrom is Rāgātmikā. Thus we arrive at the proper definition of these technical terms—इष्टे स्वारमिकी रागः परमाविष्टता भवेत् । तन्मयी या भवेद् भक्तिः सात्र रागात्मिका दिता ॥ (Bhaktirasūptasādhū, Pūrva II, 131) Rāga is ex-

assive concentration naturally directed towards the desired Being Bhagavān, and the process of devotion based upon this is called Rāgātmikā. This Rāgātmikā bhakti characterises only the constant associates of Bhagavān in His beatific sports. Exactly this stage cannot be reached by human beings; yet for the latter to attain the summum bonum called Prama it is necessary for the mind to be reduced to such a state in which a similar flow of devotion based upon these personal relationships arises. Such a state of the mind is indeed possible by means of constant practices for years and years together. Hence the Sādhana bhakti at this stage is called Rāgānugā.

✧ The superiority of this Rāgānugā bhakti over the Injunctory one lies in the fact that while in the Injunctory bhakti devotional practice proceeds from a fear of the transgression that would be consequent upon non-compliance with the injunctions of the scriptures, in the Rāgānugā it is irrespective of such injunctions and follows as a natural spontaneous flow.

✓ This irrespectiveness of scriptural injunctions, again, does not detract from the merit of Rāgānugā bhakti as the highest Dharma, as a follower of the Mimāṃsā system attempts to establish. Thus from Jaimini's sūtra—**वोदनालक्षणोऽर्थो धर्मः** it appears that Dharma is that which is enjoined by scriptural injunctions and that religious merit follows from a compliance with these injunctions. There is indeed truth in this statement, the more because it is corroborated by the Bhāṣ. text—

श्रुतिस्मृती ममैवाज्ञे यस्ते उल्लङ्घ्यवर्त्तते ।

आज्ञाच्छेदी मम द्वेयी मद्भक्तोऽपि न वैष्णवः ॥

which means that since the scriptural texts—Śruti and Smṛti—are the commandments of Bhagavān, one not following them is a violator of Bhagavān's commandments and as such cannot be regarded a devotee of God. There is thus an apparent anomaly here, and a reconciliation can be brought about in the following way:—Though Bhakti is the highest Dharma, it is

differentiated from other kinds of Dharma in many respects one of which is that devotional spirit—the main feature in the Bhakti Cult—is not always necessarily guided by a detailed and accurate knowledge of scriptural injunctions as the other dharmas are; the main guiding force in this case is the intrinsic potency and magnetic influence of the sweet names and auspicious qualities of Bhagavān. Experience shows that the attainment of the highest bonum in this cult may be practicable in some cases even irrespectively of an accurate knowledge of scriptural texts. Indeed the injunctory force of scriptural texts is not to be ignored; but it is to be distinctly noted that such force is urgently necessary in those cases only when the mind is for many reasons not in a state of calmness and composure so as to be fit for excessive devotional spirit but is very much susceptible to various distractions caused by worldly affairs. And in these cases the scriptural injunctions are to be strictly obeyed and considered as the best instrumentality for effecting that state of the mind in which a fervent devotion, an insatiable hankering after realisation, a natural uninterrupted flow of devotion will arise for the ultimate highest good of the individual being. The sole object of a strict compliance with the scriptural injunctions in the primary stage of Bhakti is thus to prepare the mind for that higher stage of devotion which is called Rāgānugā. If, therefore, such an enviable state of the mind is once reached—if, in other words, the object of the scriptural injunctions is fulfilled—, there is no longer felt any more necessity for a strict compliance with these very injunctions. Thus at this higher stage of Bhakti, if the injunctions are violated at all, such violation is not to be considered as a wilful one but takes place rather spontaneously; the mind at this stage is so deeply concentrated towards the whole concept of Bhagavān, the Jīva has come up to such a high degree of buoyancy in devotional spirits, that no other consciousness

there can be no fear of the transgression due to an unconscious violation of the rules of scriptures. Wilful violation is always a sin, but not so an unconscious one. Moreover, the excessive devotional fervency which characterises the Rāgātmikā Bhakti is so very important in the cult of Bhakti, that even if one imitatingly follows this line of devotion from an insincere or sinister motive like the demoness Pūtānā, he is amply rewarded by the grace of Bhagavān (cf. पूतना लोकवा-

लक्ष्मी राक्षसी रुधिराशना । जिघांसयापि हरये स्तनं दत्त्वाप सद्-
गतिम् । किं पुनः श्रद्धया भक्त्या कृष्णाय परमात्मने । यच्छुन प्रिय-
तरं किं नु रक्तास्तन्मातरो यथा ॥, Bhāg.). The only thing to be carefully noted here is that the fervent devotion must always be a consistent and sincere one, and never a sham mockery. Instances are not rare in the world's history of religion, in which a gross abuse of the salutary principles of religion, a lamentable tyranny of religion, so to say, works greatest evils both to the individual and to the society. Take the case of the present state of many a follower of the Bengal Vaiṣṇavism. What a serious havoc and mischief is being done to the good name and high prestige of the noble religion of the Vaiṣṇavas by many a so called saint and sham renouncer of the world! To think of the height of their folly and gross degeneration simply shudders one to the bristle. In the name of Rāgātmikā Bhakti these heretics of the first order are committing all sorts of hypocrisy, forgery, debauchery, lewdness and what not. Such a pitiable state of things, such a regrettable tyranny of Vaiṣṇavism is, I am afraid, mainly due to the blind and erroneous exposition of many a so called insincere irresponsible exponents and gurus that came to rise in consequence of a sad misconception of the lofty teachings of Lord Gourāṅga and His adherents and followers. The sooner this ghostly shadow

of Gauḍiya Vaiṣṇavism is made to disappear, the better for the country, for the world, for the prestige of Religion, for seekers after truth in the sphere of the Bhakti cult. Thus it appears that the injunctory force of scriptural texts applies with all stringency to those cases preeminently in which there is a mischievous show of Rāgānugā Bhakti and nothing in reality and earnest sincerity. (The texts cited above, therefore, do not signify that scriptural injunctions are to be ignored or violated. On the other hand these injunctions are strictly binding upon those who are far away from the stage of Rāgānugā; even those who have reached this stage are required to abide by the injunctions not so much for themselves as for putting a check upon other people who might have done otherwise and so been led astray owing to sheer ignorance and gross folly.

What is stated above, viz, that an excessive fervency and buoyancy in devotional spirit, even though displayed from an insincere and sinister motive, is amply rewarded by the grace of Bhagavān, requires a little explanation. The explanation can be made clear by means of an example in which this very fact was illustrated, viz—the life of Śiśupāla. All his acts were directed in vindictiveness towards Kṛṣṇa. Necessarily, throughout his whole life the only thought at all moments in his mind was the thought of Bhagavān; but such deep concentration was concealed by an outer covering in the shape of a motive of vindictiveness. Irrespectively of this outer covering, Bhagavān was moved towards him simply on account of the inner spirit of devotion. The effect of the 'within' can not but take place notwithstanding the 'without', just in the same way as a pill of quinine enclosed in a sugar coating cannot but cure malaria. Consequently, Bhagavān whom no amount of vindictiveness and ill-feeling, the effect of Tamas, can ever affect, and who is always conquered by the depth of meditation, favoured him with the desirable permanent good

in the shape of Sāyujya Mukti. It is here to be noted also that because of the outercovers of vindictiveness which occupies the lowest place in the hierarchy of springs of action, Śiśupāla could not attain the highest bonum Prema—a good that is attained by nothing short of the same buoyancy in devotional spirits manifested in a congenial and sympathetic way.

(This flowing current of meditation and excessive concentration has been given such a high place in Vaiṣṇava philosophy that this, even though manifested in an apathetic and vindictive way, is superior to Injunctory Bhakti directed sympathetically.)

(From the above theory it appears that the injunctory force of scriptural texts, though not discarded, is not regarded as compulsory and stringent in the case of Rāgānugā as in the case of Injunctory Bhakti. Hence also it might be doubted by some that one having reached the stage of Rāgānugā may be liable to commit wrongs and transgressions, and thereby his hope of attaining summumbonum might be deferred. This doubt can be removed by saying that since a devotee of such a high order is not inclined even towards the permanent good like self-realisation (Mukti), how can his mind have the slightest bend towards gross acts or wrongs? If at any rate such a devotee does commit a slight transgression at any time, this will be entirely counteracted forthwith by the depth of his meditation towards Bhagavan: the Immanent Regulator residing in his heart will be ever ready to counteract the effect of such a slight transgression. The idea here is similar to that stated in the Gītā text—“अपि चेत् सुदुराचारो भजते मामनन्यभाक् etc.”)

As indicated above, one of the distinctive features of Rāgātmikā Bhakti is that the practice of devotion is based upon various personal relationships brought about between Bhaga-

vān and His constant associates. In the highest stage of such devotion i.e. the devotion of Rādhā and her associate Gopīs, various demonstrations of conjugal love are necessarily given a free play to. The theory of Vaisnava Religion, specially on this vital point, is, I am afraid, severely criticised and stigmatised as an obscenity by many both here and abroad. While acknowledging that such sharp criticism may naturally originate in a human mind, so full of obscenities and gross sensualities as it is, it must be admitted at the same time that this deplorable confusion of the supersensuous with the sensual is simply based upon a miserable ignorance of the true theory of Vaisnava Religion. As a caution against such miserable misconception let us try to explain the point as follows.—In the first place, it is quite a patent fact that a passion for God can never be the same as a sensual passion. Both indeed are desires, but, while the former is a desire entirely for effecting Bhagavān's supreme pleasure, the latter is a desire for one's own pleasure. In the various demonstrations of sensual conjugal love which we find generally in the case of a human couple, there cannot be the slight tinge of doubt that the pleasure derived therefrom is really desired and enjoyed by the consort in question. Let us now look to the Bhāg. text on this point—यत्ते सुजातचरणाम्बुरुहं स्तनेषु भीताः शनैः प्रियदधीमहि कर्कशेषु etc. A thorough explanation of this verse is useless for our present purpose. It is however quite apparent from the line that the Gopīs in the midst of ecstatic sports indeed allowed Kṛṣṇa to make all sorts of demonstration of conjugal love: but the point to be carefully noted is that they had not the slightest desire for their own pleasure while such demonstration was going on. May I now ask with all deference can any mortal woman be ever conceived who will not entertain any

the least desire for such sensual pleasure and who will not actually enjoy a pleasure of this kind however slight it might be? This at once conclusively proves that the love or passion manifested by the Gopīs can never come under the category of sensual love. If, again, in the face of this conclusion it be redargued—Why is it that Bhagavān takes to such sports? Could His Kṛṣṇatma be affected had the Gopīs not displayed such demonstrations of conjugal love?" The only answer is what we get from the Ved. sūtra **लोकवत्तु लीलाकैवल्यम्** Since the concept of the Absolute Being centres round Infinite Bliss, whatever He does is nothing but a sport; and if the meaning of sports is to be really understood it must be indicated that in them infinite pleasure of the highest intensity and similar in form to what is found amongst phenomenal beings is eternally displayed and flows in an eternal current from the very nature of Bhagavān. And because the pleasure derived from sensual conjugal love is universally admitted as the highest intensity of worldly pleasures it is natural that the Absolute should display His sports in the midst of supersensuous pleasure of a similar kind, and it is this which is referred to in the Vedānta sūtra quoted above. Besides, the Gopīs are nothing but the Divinities of the bliss potencies of Bhagavān: hence whatever they do in the demonstration of conjugal love must also be understood as coming out as an easy natural flow from the very constitution of Bhagavān. Moreover, there are lots of texts to show that many a saint and ascetic whom no amount of worldly pleasure can affect in the least, (e. g. Uddhava) desire such pleasure of conjugal love as is demonstrated by the Gopīs; this also proves that there is not the slightest tinge of sensuality in the pleasure of the Gopīs. We are thus convinced of the fact that the practice of devotion based upon the relationship of conjugal love as demonstrated by Rūdhā and her associate

Gopīs is never to be confused with the demonstration of gross sensuality by a mortal pair. A farther question on this point would meet with the only answer that "in language there is no difference between sensuality and supersensuous pleasure in idea or in reality, and that spiritualism or religion is a mere absurdity."

CHAPTER V. SUMMUMBONUM—DIFFERENT THEORIES ABOUT IT.

As indicated at the very outset, the last topic for discussion in the present treatise is the summumbonum or the ultimate end or aim of philosophy as well as of religion. It was further stated in the preceding pages that according to V. philosophy the summumbonum is Prema or strictly speaking Prema bhakti.¹ This Prema bhakti, as already indicated and as will be made clear by and by, constitutes the natural function of the self concealed from beginningless time under the influence of the Māyā Śakti. It is an idea which is always an established thing and never to be produced; in other words, it was lying implicit so long as the Māyā Śakti was operating upon the self and is made explicit by nothing else than the two stages of Bhakti. By way of a comparison of the different theories of summumbonum advocated by philosophers, Indian as well as European, it will be observed how the concept of this summumbonum is fuller and richer than the rest, and, if I am allowed to say so, is the loftiest of all. It will also be shown how this concept reconciles within itself all the various concept of summumbonum, and for that very reason is and ought to be regarded as a concept par excellence.

1. It is to be noted here that all exponents of the Ved. philosophy including Ramanuja and Madhwacharya, accept mukti as the highest aim of life; it is in Bengal Vaisnavism alone that

Indeed the topic of the ultimate aim of life has been discussed at length by philosophers every where; and from a careful review of the principal doctrines upon the point it appears that these philosophers have put forward three distinct things as the summumbonum, viz, (1) extinction of miseries, (2) attainment of pleasure, and (3) self-realisation. If we are true to the happy spirit of reconciliation which constitutes the distinctive mark of V. philosophic thought, we must admit that each of these three things no doubt partakes of the nature of good and as such may be regarded as the summumbonum from the stand point taken by a particular class of thinkers; but all the views being minutely examined, it will appear that the first two cannot really be regarded as the highest good. The highest good must consist in something positive, and hence mere extinction of miseries which is a negative thing and so quite inexplicable and indescribable like a cypher can not be regarded as the highest good. Nor can the highest good consist in pleasure for its own sake; for it is a patent fact that pleasure is best obtained when least sought about. The more directly and eagerly we seek pleasure, the less pleasure do we obtain. The more we are unmindful of it, the more do we get it. Thus whatever the character of the pleasure might be—sensuous or supersensuous, the doctrine of pleasure as the highest good is open to “the paradox that the impulse towards pleasure if too predominant defeats its own aim” (Dr. Sidgwick) The highest good thereof must consist in self-

Prema is recognised as the summumbonum—the fifth object of human pursuit. This no doubt is the distinctive feature of Bengal Vaisnavism. Nor is it to be questioned that the concept of Prema has no scriptural basis, for its broad feature, viz, the resignation of every act to the Highest Self, can be traced to the beginning verse of the Isopanishad. Besides, Prema is nothing but Mukti understood in a restricted sense, as will be indicated below.

realisation, and self-realisation, if properly understood and regarded as conveying a clear and definite import, means nothing but *Prema bhakti*. Extinction of miseries and attainment of supreme pleasure are no doubt the concomitant consequences of *Prema Bhakti*, but themselves they do not constitute the highest good. This our position may be justified by reference to some of the current principal doctrines of *summunbonum*.

To begin with the ancient Greek philosophers, we find the theory of *summunbonum* as maintained by Plato seems rather vague and indefinite. While strongly in support of virtue as the ideal for an individual being, he is not at all bereft of his own clinging to the place of pleasure also in constituting the ultimate good. To this latter effect he considers a life without enjoyment as too abstract and monotonous. Thus Plato's view about the ultimate good may be briefly described as one in which both virtue and pleasure have a place: but the great defect of his theory is that he did not try to show clearly the relation between these two, nor did he demonstrate his own tacit assumption that the two should always be harmoniously combined. This weak point, I am afraid, is mainly due to the fact that he wanted to realise the exact significance of the life of an individual by reference to that of an ideal state and not to the relation between the individual and the Highest Being.

Aristotle describes the highest good as *Eudaimonia* (well-being) which according to him consists in a perfect activity in a perfect life. The highest life, he thinks, is a contemplative or speculative life (what we call the life of science or the life of the student) which is essentially higher than the life of political activity; yet he considers that even this higher life must be built up on a basis of civic virtue, in other words, the virtues that are required in a good citizen of a state are regarded by him as a condition of happiness. Accordingly,

the acquisition of the highest good is to some extent dependent on extraneous conditions over which an individual has no complete control. It seems, therefore, that though Aristotle describes the ultimate good as Eudaimonia, he does not explain definitely the true import of this Eudaimonia; in other words, the two elements of rational activity and pleasure, which together constitute the ideal, are tacitly assumed by him as closely related, but what this relation is, what the true content of the ideal is, is left unexplained. Besides, Aristotle's selection of Eudaimonia to denote what he elsewhere calls 'Human or Practicable good', and the fact that after all we have no better rendering for Eudaimonia than Happiness or Felicity, has caused no little misunderstanding of his system of morals.

Among the cosmopolitan thinkers of Greece, we find two apparently opposing theories advanced by the Stoics and the Epicureans. The ultimate end of action according to the Stoics, is to live according to nature—to adapt oneself to the direction of Reason which is both in the world and in individual self. If it is asked—what does Reason direct? 'To live according to nature' is the one answer given by the Stoics, and thereby they involve themselves in a circular argument. Sometimes, however, we are told that the ultimate end is 'Life according to Virtue', but this also leads us into the same circle, for Virtue is defined by them as Knowledge of good and bad in different circumstances and relations, and the two notions thus become absolutely coincident. As regards the place of Happiness in their system, we are told that Virtue is Happiness in so far as it frees ourselves from the perturbing influences of the vicissitudes of life and prepares the way for the state of composure and tranquility. Taking all the diverse utterances into consideration, the only Stoic view about the ultimate end we get is 'Extinction of mis-

ries and attainment of a tranquil state.' At any rate, the full concept of summum bonum is not clearly explained.

The Epicureans considered pleasure to be the highest good, but this pleasure, they contended, if it is to be the most valuable, must be the spiritual joy which consists in the unperturbable composure of a wise-man's mind. This Egoistic theory is no doubt superior to Sensualistic Egoism; but its chief defect lies in the fact that on account of a discouragement of active strenuous life as well as for the efforts of an epicurean sage solely directed towards the extinction of pain rather than in pursuit of positive pleasure, the concept of summum bonum according to them amounts to a negative thing, and hence it cannot really be regarded as the summum bonum.

Turning to the mediaeval period, we find the ethical ideas of that period were influenced partly by those of Plato and Aristotle, and partly also by those of the Stoics, and by conceptions derived from Christianity. It is deemed useless therefore to deal separately with their view about the summum bonum of life.

If, again, we look to the modern period, we find two main theories growing side by side. Philosophers like Locke, Hume, Mill, Bain and Sidgwick hold that the summum bonum of human life consists in the acquisition of pleasure as such. On the other hand, the greatest German philosopher Hegel and his followers are of opinion that the highest good consists in self-realisation. This Perfection Theory was, it seems to me, developed very greatly by the most distinguished of such thinkers, viz Professor Green. It is necessary, therefore, to deal with his theory in some detail. The want or defect which men are perpetually seeking to fill up is according to Green not the want of pleasure merely, or any superficial form of feeling, but something deeper and belonging to

our essential nature as spiritual beings. We feel constantly the need of completing our own being, completing or realising ourselves, or making ourselves all that we are meant to be in the divine plan of the world. This completing, realising or filling up our nature is the good or the highest end to which we all naturally tend. And so far we can conceive and understand it, it is a moral end or good because activity will, conduct are the essence of our nature, so that the highest perfection of our nature is the real perfection of will. What then about pleasure or happiness? Has it no place in our moral scheme? Yes, it has, but not as a direct object of desire but as an accompaniment and consequence of the fulfilling of the desire. If we make pleasure to be the direct end of our action, we soon give it our own purpose and gain no pleasure; at the same time we cannot desire and realise an end without getting pleasure from it as the consequence. But we now come to the final question—In what does this perfection of nature—this highest selfrealisation, the ultimate end or highest good of our nature, consist? Here indeed an unavoidable difficulty arises from the very nature of the case. For, how can we understand what perfection of spiritual nature is without being ourselves perfect? Evidently we can understand such perfection only step by step in proportion as we ourselves attain it. Hence though we feel that there is always a higher stage of perfection which remains unattained, still we can represent it to ourselves. Thus we might define moral good as that which satisfies the desire and wants of a rational moral agent. (i. e. of an agent who has already perfected himself so far as to be able to judge beforehand along what lines his future development will extend). Now it is clear that this is a circular definition—that line of action is good which a good man desires and approves, and a good man is one who

approves of such a line of action. But something of the circle is unavoidable. In short, selfrealisation can be explained only as a gradual reproduction in our minds, from our own finite points of view, of an ideal present already in a universal consciousness.

From the above it appears that Green though he has hit upon the right point, is unable to explain clearly the full import of self realisation and thereby involves himself in an inextricable circular reasoning. The term selfrealisation no doubt implies an act, but the exact nature of this act of the (finite) self with reference to the (Infinite) Self need be clearly pointed out. This failure on the part of Green, which makes his theory full of vagueness and repetition, is, I am afraid, due to the fact that he could not realise the meaning of the full concept of the Absolute Being, the relation between the Absolute and individual soul, and the proper means to be adopted for attaining self-realisation. It will be shown how these weak points in the Self-realisation Theory can be avoided if we regard Prema Bhakti as the summumbonum of human life to be attained only by means of Bhakti.

Let us consider some of the Indian theories on the subject. The best way of indicating the development of Indian philosophical and religious thought is to begin with what is described as the lowest stage. The system of Chārvāka is generally described as such. The only end of man is here described as enjoyment proved by sensual pleasures. But from the trend of argument based upon the admissibility of perception alone as the source of knowledge and relating to the enjoyment of worldly objects which are mixed with pleasure as well as pain, it also appears that avoidance of pain might be regarded by this system as the end of man. There is a vagueness on this point. At any rate the system as it stands is to be rejected so far as the summumbonum is concerned.

ned; for it not only conflicts with the fundamental principles of Hindu religious thought, but is not acceptable even to the present state of the materialism in Europe.

According to the Buddhist theory, as it is generally described, the *summumbonum* is 'Extinction of miseries, arising from the extirpation of desires etc.—the stream of cognitions and impressions'. The latter, viz, annihilation of desires, is thus described as the means to the end called here *Nirvāṇa*. Here also the *summumbonum* is described as a negative thing and hence should not be properly called the highest good, for Release according to this theory means 'passing over into non-being'.

The Sāṅkhya system holds that the *summumbonum* consists in the absolute annihilation of miseries, brought about by the discriminating knowledge of *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa*. This also is evidently described as a negative thing and hence cannot properly be regarded as the *summumbonum*.

The Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika systems agree in holding that the *summumbonum* consists in the absolute abolition of pain, but differ as to the means for attaining that end. Some however, e. g., Mādhavāchāryya draw a fine distinction between these two doctrines of *summumbonum*. While according to the Vaiśeṣika system the state of emancipation is one of absolute freedom from all connexion with attributes, with the Naiyāyikas the soul even in this state is attended with bliss and *samvit* or cognition. But it is to be noted that according to the Nyāya system attributes arise only when there is conjunction of the self and mind, and hence the state of emancipation according to this view cannot but be an absolute freedom from all connexion with attributes, in other words, bliss and cognition cannot be attached to the state of absolute abolition of pain. Notwithstanding minute differences, all these systems

are open to one serious defect, viz that something negative is described as the summumbonum.

The Mīmāṃsā system solely concerned with the Karma Kāṇḍa of the Vedas, holds that the summumbonum consists in the Apūrva (merit) produced by the due performance of sacrificial rites as enjoined in the Vedas. Against this view it might be said that whatever is produced by means of non-permanent destructible objects e.g. a jar produced by clay cannot but be transitory and destructible. Sacrificial rites are performed with destructible objects like faggots, ghee and the like, and consequently the Apūrva which is here described as something produced by the performance of such rites must itself be a non-permanent thing. Thus the Mīmāṃsist's doctrine of summumbonum is to be highly deprecated in-as-much as it characterises it as something non-permanent, quite contrary to the fact that the highest good always consists in something permanent. From this criticism, however, it is not to be understood that Bhakti also, meaning an act, is non-permanent; for according to our theory Bhakti is not a thing to be produced but an act in which the manifestation of bliss and knowledge—the essential attributes of the soul, which was obscured and contracted by Karma, is made explicit and posited.

Others again hold that the summumbonum consists in the union (Yoga) of the individual soul with Paramātmā, and this union, they say, arises in consequence of high intensity of thought about the contiguous existence of Paramātmā and Jiva. The question is—what is the meaning of this Yoga? It may mean either (1) that the individual soul is transformed into Pramātmā, or that (2) the two entities undergoing a transformation become one. In the first case, owing to the intrinsic difference admitted by these philosophers between Pramātmā and soul, the soul can never be intrinsically transformed into Pramātmā just in the same way as an iron

rod though excessively heated (i. e. brought into contact with fire) can never be transformed into fire. In the second case, the admission that Paramātmā undergoes a change is quite contradictory to the very essential nature of Paramātmā, and hence can never be upheld. The only meaning possible of union is that by constant meditation in an uninterrupted flow of thought the soul can attain to that state in which it ever remains with Paramātmā, performing its own function of devotion, and never deviates from Him.

CHAPTER VI.

THE HIGHEST GOOD OR SUMMUMBONUM IN THE VAIṢṆAVA SYSTEM.

If we look to the Vedānta system, we find the summum bonum is characterised as Mukti by the followers of Śāṅkara. This Mukti according to their view consists of three elements, viz (1) absolute merge or absorption of soul in Brahman, (2) absence of the consciousness of any feeling what-so-ever, hence no feeling of joy, (3) extinction of miseries caused by the withdrawal of Māyā or illusion. The first factor is established by them mainly on the basis of scriptural texts such as ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति (Mund. III, 2, 9), न तस्य प्राणा उत्क्रामन्ति अत्रैव समवलीयन्ते ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्माप्येति (Vīh. IV, 4, 6) in which the ideas of ब्रह्मवेदन or ब्रह्माप्यय, and ब्रह्मभाव are taken by them as identical. But the fact is, there is some difference in meaning, for otherwise the Śruti would be regarded as a fruitless repetition and the mere mention of any one of the three e.g. ब्रह्मभाव would have been quite enough. To avoid such repetition of ideas the word ब्रह्मभाव or what is also called ब्रह्मसम्पत्ति is to be understood to mean that the individual does not attain sameness or identity with Brahman but posits its own intrinsic similarity to Brahman, the similarity

which consists in the attributes of bliss and knowledge and which was lying concealed and suppressed by the *Māyā Śakti* of Brahman. This doctrine of similarity is also clearly stated in the text निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति (Mund. III. 1. 3) where साम्य means not identity but similarity, and in the (Īta text इदं ज्ञानमुपाश्रित्य मम साधर्म्यमागताः (XIV, 2) where साधर्म्य evidently means the same, and also in the text एवमेव सम्प्रसादोऽस्माच्छरीरात् समुत्थाय परं ज्योतिरूपसम्पद्य स्वेन रूपेण अभिनिष्पद्यते (Chhā. VIII, 3, 5, also Maitri. II, 2). Thus from all the texts it appears that in the state of release the soul does not become identical with Brahman but stands to Brahman in the relation of difference as well as non-difference. The difference between Brahman and a released soul is referred to in the *Veśānta Sūtras*¹ जगद्व्यापारवर्जं प्रकण्ठाद् सन्निहितत्वात् (IV, 4, 17), भोगमात्रसाम्यलिङ्गाच्च (IV, 4, 21), मुक्तोपसृप्यव्यपदेशाच्च (I, 3, 2).

1. These three sūtras have been thus interpreted by Ramanuja — The Sūtra IV, 4, 17 means that the difference between Brahman and soul must be admitted since there are many leading scriptural texts which speak of universal ruling and world-controlling power with exclusive reference to the Supreme Person, and since in all those cases the contexts in no way suggest the idea of the released soul, and hence there is no reason to ascribe such power to the latter.' The Sūtra IV, 4, 21, means that the conclusion arrived at in the above sūtra viz the inequality between Brahman and Jīva is confirmed by the further fact that the text directly teaches the released soul to be equal to Brahman in so far only as enjoying direct insight into the true nature of Brahman. The Sūtra I, 3, 2, means that the Person, who is the abode of heaven, earth and so on, is also declared by the text to be what is to be reached by those who are released from the bondage of Samsara i.e. existence. From this it evidently follows that there is no identity between Brahman and individual soul.

From the second factor it appears that the nature of Brahman being, according to their view, bliss, the soul in release becomes bliss; but this is quite unwarranted by facts, for possibly no desire can arise for becoming bliss or happiness, all desire is for attaining happiness. Hence if there is thus no desire for such a state of release, the injunctory force of all scriptural texts would be regarded as nil and the state itself in which there is no feeling of joy is a futile object for which no effort would be undertaken and no desire entertained. In a word, there would be no ब्रह्मज्ञानासा at all. That in the state of release there is a consciousness of some feeling—there is felt some pleasure or happiness, is clearly established by such texts as रसं हेवायं लब्धवानन्दी भवति, आत्मरतिः आत्म कीदृ etc (Chhā. VII, 25, 2) And we already explained that true self-realisation is that in which pleasure though not desired arises as an inevitable concomitant consequence. As to the Vṛh. text (II, 4, 12,), it is to be noted that it does not declare that the released self has no consciousness, but only that in the case of that self there is absent that knowledge of birth, death etc, which in the Saṃsāra state is caused by the connection of the self with the elements.

The third factor also is untenable, since, according to their view the sole reality being Brahman, this Brahman whose nature is pure bliss can never come in contact with miseries due to Nescience; and consequently the question of the rise of miseries and so of the annihilation of miseries can not arise at all.

Thus the doctrine of summumbonum as Mukti defined above according to the purely monistic theory of the Vedānta is untenable; and the untenability is owing to the wrong interpretation of the Vedānta whereby Brahman is described as pure bliss and knowledge—as a non-differenced Substance. The true interpretation of the Vedānta upon which Vaisṇava

religion is based describes Mukti as that intuition or sight of the Highest Lord which, being the natural state and function of the individual soul but being obscured by the influence of the Māyā Śakti of Bhagavān, is posited on the destruction of the said influence by the only means of Bhakti. (cf—**मुक्तिर्हित्वान्यथारूपं स्वरूपेण व्यवस्थितिः** Bhāg. II, 10, 6).

This intuition or sight of the Highest Lord may take place in two ways, viz-(1) that the Highest Lord may reveal Himself to the contemplative mind alone (**अन्तः साक्षात्कार**), or (2) He may present Himself to the mind as well as to the different sense organs (**बहिः साक्षात्कार**).¹ Though the causality of Bhakti operates alike in both the cases, yet there is some difference between the two. The sensuous nature of the mind (**चित्त**) is no doubt transformed into the spiritual supersensuous one in both the cases by means of devotional practices; in other words, all the previous impressions and ideas caused by the operation of the Māyā Śakti are entirely abolished, and the mind is thereby reduced to a state of complete tranquility and calmness. But in the latter case, by reason of the excessive fervency of devotion and the consequent overflowing grace of Bhagavān, the sense organs also are similarly transformed and reduced into the supersensuous nature and thereby the Highest Lord appears before the devotee just in the same way as in the phenomenal world one being bodily presents himself before another so as to be directly and vividly perceived by the latter. Briefly speaking, the difference between the two kinds of intuition or sight is in respect of vividness and perspicuity. The most essential condition however for both the two cases consists in all fetters of the heart being rent asunder, all doubts being removed and all impressions of previous acts being entirely

1. See Appendix.

effaced, as we come to know from the Śruti text **मिचते हृदय
ग्रन्थिः** etc. The sole requisiteness of this condition of tran-
quility of the mind might be more clearly explained by refe-
rence to Bhāg. texts. We know that during the manifest
Līlā many beings like Indra and others could not have the
same intuition of Kṛṣṇa as the Gopas and Gopīs had, although
Kṛṣṇa appeared before all. The only reason is that on
account of the mentality of those beings not till then reaching
the state of composure, Kṛṣṇa did not reveal Himself to them
in His intrinsic Selfhood but concealed Himself under the
screen of His Yoga Māyā Śakti (cf **नाहं प्रकाशः सर्वस्य योग
मायसमावृतः**). In the case of Śiśupala again we know
from the same Bhāg. texts that before the total annihilation
of his body he could not sight the Lord in the desirable way;
it was only after his vindictive spirit was entirely effaced,
after the last trace of obstructing impressions was removed
by means of the supersensuous halo of His own attributes,
after the corporeal frames, gross as well as subtle, were
utterly destroyed, that Kṛṣṇa presented Himself before Śiśu-
pala in His intrinsic selfhood, and thereby Śiśupala was
graced with the Sāyujya Mukti.

The state of the mind which has not attained such tran-
quility and cleanliness has been broadly classified into two,
viz-(1) those minds that are averse to the Supreme Lord
and (2) those that are hostile to Him. The former again is
subdivided into two—(1) those that are so completely addic-
ted to worldly objects that they remain quite indifferent to
Him even during His Prakāṣa Līlā, (2) those that are full of
contempt towards Him e. g. Indra during the manifest Līlā.
The latter also admits of two subclasses—(1) some not being
able to realise the graceful charm of the Lord are ill-dispo-
sed towards Him e. g. Kālayavana during the Prakāṣa Līlā,

(2) some again are vindictive towards Him e. g. the demoniac heroes and warriors during the Prakāṣa Līlā. The fine distinction between these four classes may be explained thus by way of analogy. The taste of a sweet thing to a tongue affected with biliousness appears in four different ways as our medical experience shows, viz-(1) some do not taste it without showing any feeling of contempt and disregard, (2) some do not taste it and at the same time show a feeling of contempt, (3) some again accept the sweet thing and taste it unwillingly and with averseness because they are fond of bitter things (4) while others taste it as a bitter thing and show an averseness while tasting. Similar is the distinction in the case of the above four classes of mental state.

On this meaning of Mukti as sight of the Lord the Śruti text is स वा एवं पश्यन्नेवं मन्वान एवं विज्ञान् आत्मरतिः आत्म-
क्रीडः आत्ममिथुन आत्मानन्दः स स्वराद् भवति सर्वेषु लोकेषु काम-
चारी भवति । Mukti thus defined is of five kinds (1) Salokya (2) Sārṣṭi, (3) Sārūpya, (4) Sāmīpya and (5) Sāyujya. Salokya means 'the being entitled to a habitation in the super-sensuous highest heaven-the abode of Bhagavān'. Sārṣṭi means 'acquiring a lordliness (similar to that of the Absolute Lord) in the same supreme place'. Sārūpya means 'gaining a form and complexion similar to those of the Lord'. Sāmīpya is the acquisition of a right to go near the Supreme Lord, and Sāyujya means merging in the supreme halo of the lustre of Bhagavān. Of these, the Sāyujya Mukti is not given so much importance as the others in the system of V. Philosophy, for in this state the individual personality of a Jīva vanishes though temporarily, and this fact is contradictory to the fundamental principles of V. Philosophy. Yet the Bhāg. texts recognise it to some extent simply to show how the cult of Bhakti is to be regarded as the excellent means whereby all the bonums

recognised by all the different systems of religion prevailing anywhere in the world can be acquired according to the desire of the devotee. The lesser importance of this Sāyujya Mukti is illustrated by the fact that those beings like Śiśupala and others that were granted this bonum were again relieved of that state and made His associates in the eternal Līlā so as to make them attain the highest bonum-Prema Bhakti.

Characteristics of Mukti :—

The first and most essential characteristic of Mukti in all the five different stages is that in it there takes place that intuition or direct perception of the Ab-solute Lord which as a bonum is far superior to all the bonums in other systems of philosophy both Indian and European. This intuition is inevitably attended with supreme pleasure, for Mukti is nothing but the positment of the intrinsic nature of a Jiva which nature consists in bliss and knowledge.

Secondly, Mukti is something beyond the jurisdiction of the Māyā and hence called Guṇātīta. Unless and until all fetters of Karma are rent asunder, such a state cannot be reached. (cf. भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिः etc)

Thirdly, it is a state from which there is no more fall or return into the world. This is clearly stated in the last Sūtra of the Vedānta—अनावृत्तिः शब्दात् as well as in the Gītā text यद् गत्वा न निवर्त्तन्ते तद्धाम परमं मम (XV, 6), and in the Śruti text न स पुनरावर्त्तन्ते (Chhā. VIII, 15, 1). Fourthly, it entails the exhaustion of all acts that have already begun to fructify and consequently the abolition of all pain. Fifthly, it implies that not only the gross body but the subtle body also is utterly put an end to. As to this point there is the Tāṇḍi-na Śruti अश्व इव रोमाणि विधूय धून्वा शरीरमकृतं कृतात्मा ब्रह्म-लोकमभिलेभवानि 1, cited in Pritisandarbhā, p. 693. These are some of the common characteristics to be considered along

with the distinctive features of each of the five different kinds of Mukti mentioned above.

From the above it appears that there are three main elements in Mukti, viz—(1) intuition or sight of the Lord, (2) attainment or rather regaining of the natural bliss or beatitude which was so long lying concealed, (3) Extinction of miseries. The first two factors being positive in character constitute the summumbonum in the proper sense of the term, and these factors are inseparably connected or coextensive. Bliss therefore plays an important part in the summumbonum; but if bliss is to constitute a factor in the summumbonum, it must be the highest bliss or greatest supersensuous pleasure. What then is this highest bliss?—From various Śruti texts e. g. सैषा आनन्दस्य मीमांसा भवति (Taitt. II, 8, 1), एष एव परम आनन्दः (Vṛh. IV, 3, 33), एषोऽस्य परम आनन्द एतस्यैवानन्दस्यान्यानि भूतानि मात्रामुपजीवन्ति (Vṛh. IV, 3, 32), स परम आनन्दः (Nṛsiṃhottarātāpani), we know that pleasure reaches the culminating point in respect of quantity as well as quality in the Absolute Lord alone and is such that no words can describe it, no mind can conceive of it. Hence it is Bhagavān alone—the Rasa of the Upaniṣads—that is the only source of that pleasure which constitutes an element in the summumbonum, and to this effect Mukti is referred to in the texts आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान् न विभेति कुतश्चन (knowing or realising the bliss of Brahman an individual soul tears not any thing, Tait II, 4, 1), येनाहं नामृतः स्यां किमहं तेन कुर्याम् (Vṛh. II, 4, 3, also IV, 5, 4). Then the question, is, how to attain such pleasure? We have already noticed that the best way of attaining pleasure is not to desire it; the more we are unmindful of a pleasure, the more we get it. Hence though the attainment of the supreme pleasure which constitutes the most essential attribute of Bhagavān is an inseparable factor in the

sumnum bonum, yet we must admit that this cannot be the highest object of desire. But, since the highest good consists in the highest object of desire, it is necessary to show what this highest object of desire is. It is nothing but the intuition or sight (साक्षात्कार) of the Lord; and, if it is to be inevitably attended with the highest pleasure, this sight must be of a very high order and not an ordinary one we generally experience. We perceive many things in nature, but few attract our notice and create our interest and cause our delight. In the sphere of science, for instance, mere perception counts for nothing unless it turns into an observation which by way of creating an interest and delight on the part of the observer leads to many a marvellous discovery. We sight many people here and there, but those only create our delight with whom a personal relationship—a loving personal relationship like fraternity, friendliness, conjugality or the like is established; and in such cases the sight or perception is not merely a side glance which is purely effected by the sense of sight alone, but one which is constantly repeated over and over again and which, being not merely the sight of the form but also of the thought, is one in which all the different sense organs as well as the organs of action equally perform their respective functions. Similarly, in the case of Bhagavan that sight causes the greatest pleasure which is repeated over and over again and which is not merely the sight of the spiritualised eye but an act in which all the supersensuous senses are actively engaged in performing their respective functions as if out of a spirit of vying each other. In the language of Tennyson we might say that though in the state of the five different Muktis mentioned above the cross lightning of the four eyes of Kṛṣṇa and his devotee might flash a devotional love into fiery life, but that love is seldom but master of all which follows the deardiminutives characterising the four-

fold personal relationship that is eternally displayed between Kṛṣṇa and His constant beatific associates. In other words, the sight of the highest Lord must no doubt be effected by the eye-like Bhakti, but, if the vision is to be the clearest of all, the eye of Bhakti must be tinged with the collyrium of Prema; and then and then only the highest supersensuous pleasure will be effected.

We now come to a stage in which what was so long Mukti as a mere sight of the Lord becomes the clearest vision of the same Lord and gets the appellation of Bhakti—I mean the highest stage of Bhakti which was previously indicated as Prema Bhakti.

The word Prema Bhakti therefore means an act of devotion in which fervent love (called here Prīti) towards Bhagavān plays an important part as the underlying principle, and it is by means of such intense love alone that Bhagavān realises the highest pleasure—by this alone He is conquered, so to say, by the devotee for whose satisfaction he can do anything and everything at all times under all circumstances. By this act not only the highest pleasure of Bhagavān is effected, but a feeling of intense supersensuous joy is also felt by the devotee himself. This therefore is truly and preeminently called self-realisation—it is a realisation by the self called devotee of the Highest Self Bhagavān who eternally realises His own bliss by means of His bliss potency and thereby makes the devotee also realise the same supreme pleasure as much as practicable—it is a realisation of such a wonderful character that the devotee though not unconscious of the supreme feeling of joy is however lesser and lesser conscious the more and more he advances in the hierarchy of gradations. The meaning of self-realisation which is only vaguely understood and expressed by the school of Professor Green is thus clearly explained and established on a sound and sure basis

by the system of Vaiṣṇava philosophy. The very term 'realisation' no doubt indicates an act irrespectively of any biased commentary, and this meaning is the self-same implication following naturally and easily from the etymology of the word Bhakti.

This act is further designated as *Sevā* or servitude to Bhagavān, and is one in which the mind and the different senses of the devotee having got a spiritualistic nature are equally engaged in performing their respective functions—directed towards nothing but the pleasure of Bhagavān, and whatever contributes to Bhagavān's pleasure cannot but cause the pleasure of the devotee. The latter pleasure, however, is not the object of desire, but follows as an enevitable concomitant consequence. The sole object of desire here is servitude to Bhagavān, so much so that even the pleasure called here *Premananda* which follows as a matter of necessity is sometimes regarded as an obstacle, as it were, if it causes such physiological changes as impede the act of *Sevā*.

It thus appears that Mukti understood in this restricted sense is really to be designated as *Prema Bhakti* or accurately speaking *Pṛiti Bhakti*. And if Mukti in the wide sense be regarded as the summumbonum, *Pṛiti Bhakti* should be fittingly characterised as the highest summumbonum. Or, to use the current phraseology, we might say that according to V. philosophy the summumbonum or the highest good consists in *Pṛiti Bhakti*, whereas the concept of Mukti as appears in the above five grades of Mukti, Mukti as understood by the school of Śāṅkara, self-realisation as explained by the school of Green, and all the lower concepts of summumbonum according to the various classes of thinkers Indian and European—all these objects which are the enevitable concomitant consequence of the attainment of *Pṛiti Bhakti* should be regarded as so many bonums, and thereby the reconciliation of V. philosophy with

all other current systems of philosophy would be clearly brought about.

What, then, is the relation between Mukti and Bhakti? We have already seen that since Bhakti is the only means of realisation, even Mukti the lesser bonum than Priti Bhakti cannot be attained by any means other than Bhakti, far be it said of the latter. This superiority of Priti Bhakti is so much emphasised in the system of V. philosophy that for the purpose of attainment thereof even a desire for Mukti is regarded as belonging to the lower grade in the hierarchy of springs of action and placed almost on the same footing as a low propensity. The attendant pleasure in the state of Mukti is no doubt of a supreme nature absolutely different from sensuous pleasure; but the supreme pleasure consequent upon the attainment of Priti Bhakti is of such a high order that even those saintly devotees who at first have voluntarily accepted the bonum of Mukti are described in the Bhāg. texts as showing a good deal of hankering after the summumbonum Priti Bhakti and carrying on devotional practices accordingly. So we find in the Sowparṇa Śruti text सर्वदैतमुपासीत यावद् विमुक्तिर्भुक्ता ह्येतमुपासते, that He (Kṛṣṇa) should always be devoted to and meditated upon till the attainment of Mukti; and even those that are thus favoured with this good should continue their devotional practices till they attain the summumbonum. The Nṛs. Tāpanī Śruti य वै सर्वे वेदाग्रामनन्ति मुमुक्षवो ब्रह्मवादिनश्च (II, 4) points to the same conclusion, viz that H.—Kṛṣṇa—is devoted to and worshipped by all—by those that are desirous of release and those also that have attained it. The Gītā texts teach the same doctrine, viz. that amongst the different grades of realisers of truth, one having attained Mukti and marked with a devotion of fervent love is regarded the most preeminent तेषां ज्ञानी नित्य-

मुक्त एकभक्तिविशिष्यते (VII, 17). From these and various other scriptural texts it is quite evident that between *Prīti Bhakti* and *Mukti* there exists the same relation of *Bhedābheda* which characterises the whole system of *Vaiṣṇava* philosophy, difference because the former is a *summumbonum* while the latter a *bonum*, non-difference because the three factors viz., sight of the Lord, consciousness of a feeling of supreme joy, and extinction of miseries are common to both.

CHAPTER VII.

DEFINITE CHARACTER & CONTENT OF PREMA

BHAKTI—THE SUMMUMBONUM.

The peculiar excellent practice of devotion called *prīti Bhakti* is thus established as the *summumbonum* in V. philosophy. But such practice, as already explained more than once, is based upon certain personal relationships which are similar to those amongst phenomenal beings—preeminently amongst men. This similarity might create some misconception in the minds of many about the supersensuous nature of the love between *Bhagavān* and devotee, and hence it is necessary to go a little deeper into this point by way of analysing the meaning of the word *Prīti*. The similarity has been nicely stated in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* text

या प्रीतिरविवेकानां विषयेष्वनपायिनी ।

त्वामनुस्मरतः सा मे हृदयान्नापसर्पतु ॥

Apparently the text means—Let not that love of personal relationship go away from my heart while I am engaged in meditation upon You—the love which is never to be effaced and which is similar to what exists between ignorant people and mundane objects. The word *Prīti* in Sanskrit is used in two senses, viz (1) that it means happiness, being a synonym for

मुद, प्रमद, हर्ष, आनन्द etc, or (2) that it means the attribute of fondness or affection synonymous to भाव, सौहृद, हार्द etc. Psychologically speaking, both the terms no doubt imply emotion, but there is some difference. Happiness is an agreeable emotion arising from the consciousness of gain or advantage of any kind either to one-self or to another. It is closely related to the sense feeling, and even though the gain or advantage might refer to others, as a feeling it is egoistic in character. The emotion of love, on the other hand, is a sentiment or emotional disposition manifesting itself in particular emotions and actions and illustrated when we are disposed to seek the welfare of the beloved object irrespective of any consideration of personal pleasure. Thus, though it might have a self-regarding significance, it is not strictly egoistic in character—it is more altruistic than egoistic. To put the thing in another way, we might say that in the emotion of love or friendship or affection there are present three main elements, viz. (1) an agreeableness towards others as objects, (2) a disposition towards, or longing for, these others which is based upon the agreeable feeling, (3) a consciousness of pleasure which is caused by a relation of those two factors. Thus we see while the thing concerned with the feeling of happiness is the self or substance in which this emotional attribute inheres, in the case of love etc both the loving self and the beloved not-self are alike concerned.¹

On the basis of this difference between happiness and love, the word Priti in the above verse is to be taken in the sense of love and not of happiness; for, had it been taken in the latter sense, a new word अनुभूयमानेषु would have been supplied so as to bring out the egoistic character just now explained. Accordingly, the text is to be interpreted to mean

1. See Appendix.

that the love to Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa when meditated upon in an uninterrupted flow of thought should be similar to the love between mother and children, between husband and wife and so on, only so far as the altruistic character of the emotional feeling is concerned. The difference however, between, these two loves is that while the latter consists of a function of the Māyā Śakti, the former consists of the Svarūpa Śakti.

Such being the case, the Prīti or, accurately speaking, the Bhāgavati Prīti may be briefly defined as that natural and spontaneous flow of divine love which is absolutely uninterrupted by any other thought or desire, which is nothing but the function of the essence of the bliss potency of Bhagavān, which purely consists of thoughts and desires quite congenial to the concept of divine servitude, which is ever on an increase in arithmetico-geometrico-harmonical progression, which throws into the background all other objects of human pursuit, which, capable of a classification into various emotional feelings, attains the highest development in the supreme consorts of Bhagavān, and which is the only thing that can subjugate even the Highest Lord ¹

The Prīti Bhakti, which considered in the general character is thus established as the summum bonum, possesses certain distinctive attributes, and these attributes operate in two ways, viz (1) that they effect a varied improvement upon the mentality of a devotee by way of generating various grades of divine emotional feelings, (2) that they arouse a distinctive consciousness in the devotee's mind to that effect. We may arrange them in the following hierarchy of super-springs of action from the lowest to the highest. Thus the Prīti or love—

- (a) causes a buoyancy of feeling in the devotee's mind ;
- (b) generates an affectionate love,

1. See Appendix.

- (c) arouses a friendly love;
- (d) causes a supersensuous abhimāna due to excessive love;
- (e) softens and melts the heart;
- (f) deepens (e);
- (g) makes (f) appear as ever fresh;
- (h) overwhelms the mind with unparalleled ecstatic effusion of love (highest stage).¹

In (a), there arises a consciousness of the Absolute Lord being the sole reality to be realised and a consequent thought that nothing else is to be resorted to. In (b), the love of the Absolute Lord is never to fade away in spite of any impediment however great; the excess of love owing to such affectionate feeling is very common in the world with respect to an irrational animal e.g. love towards a domesticated animal is always greater than that towards an undomesticated one. In (c), no amount of conventionality ever arises in the manifestation of devotional love. In (d), love of the Lord for his devotee becomes so very great—the mind of the Lord in His infinite potencies is mastered in such a way by the devotee that even He also feels diffidence and fear about His love being affected in the least. Similarly, by greater and greater development in intensity the devotional love reaches that state of climax which is called Mahābhāva. A detailed exposition of these various stages is, as already said, beyond the scope of the present treatise. It will suffice here to say that according to the theory of Vaisnava philosophy the summum bonum of a human being is that which occupies the lowest stage in the above hierarchy and which is differently styled as Prīti Bhakti or Prema Bhakti or Dāsyā Bhakti. It is the state of realisation in which the Jīva in his true self-hood takes part in

1. See Appendix.

the eternal beatific sports of Kṛṣṇa and carries on the function of devotional practice based upon the relationship between a master and his servant.

It is evident from the above that Prema Bhakti as the summumbonum must be understood with reference to Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa. But, I am afraid, from the standpoint of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism the question of summumbonum involves some controversy. It might be asserted that Prema Bhakti with reference to the beatific sports of Kṛṣṇa as displayed in the supersensuous heaven-trio is the summumbonum, while the devotional worship of Gourāṅga is the means to this end; or it might be urged that the latter act alone is the means as well as the end. To arrive at a decision we can not but refer to the Charitāmṛta texts. But the Charitāmṛta itself is rather vague on this point. While indicating the excellence of the Gourāṅga cult we already stated that the fact that in Gourāṅga are manifested in addition to His own distinctive līlā all the sports of Kṛṣṇa as displayed during the Dwāpara Yuga Līlā, is a matter of inference only. There are no explicit statements on the point save and except the fact of Gourāṅga's manifestation of the conjoint figures Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa (within Himself) to the devotee Rāya Rāmānanda. Besides, from the manner of treatment it appears that the Charitāmṛta lays all the stress upon and gives prominence to Gourāṅga's distinctive sport, viz. that He plays the role of the ideal devotee Rādhā. If, therefore, this be the true view of the Charitāmṛta, it must be admitted that the devotional worship of Gourāṅga is but the means to the summumbonum Prema understood with reference to the sports of Kṛṣṇa as displayed in the heaven-trio. If, on the otherhand, it be urged that the Charitāmṛta really gives prominence to the fact of Gourāṅga's displaying also the distinctive sports of the Dwāpara Yuga Līlā, we must conclu-

de about the other alternative regarding the summumbonum. Such indecisiveness on the point at issue is indeed unavoidable, and is due perhaps to the defect of the existing sources of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism. All that is to be carefully noted here is that, since the absoluteness of Gourāṅga is never irrespective of that of Kṛṣṇa, whichever of the two alternatives might be accepted the fact remains undisputed, viz. that the concept of Prema Bhakti, implies nothing but an individual soul's taking part in the beatific sports of Kṛṣṇa.

CONCLUDING CHAPTER.

PLACE OF MORALITY IN THE SYSTEM OF VAIṢṆAVA PHILOSOPHY.

The topic of summumbonum discussed in the previous pages leads us not unnaturally to a discussion of the question of morality in its bearing upon Vaiṣṇava Religion. Indeed the fact that there is a relation between morality and religion has been discussed by all philosophers, European and Indian. Looking to the west we find that a class of thinkers e. g. Descartes, Locke, Paley and others hold that religion is the source of morality—it is religion that makes morality. Others again e.g. Kant and Martineau suppose that morality is the source of religion. Mathew Arnold goes further to say that religion is nothing but morality with an emotion. A minute critical examination of these different views is simply useless for our present purpose. It will suffice here to say that according to all the western thinkers there is a very close relation between religion and morality. This is also the view of Indian thinkers, specially of those that are theistic. If now we want to know the definite character of this close relation between religion and morality we should note care-

fully at first the derivative meaning of the word morality. The word comes from root 'mores' which means conduct. Conduct, again, is best defined as those acts which are not merely adjusted to ends but also definitely willed. And because the conduct coming within the purview of the science of morality is an ideal conduct, those acts which are thus definitely willed must be adjusted to the highest end. By saying that the acts are definitely willed we of course imply according to the Hindus that in such acts some sort of freedom of the will is asserted. Apart from the controversy amongst western thinkers between the two doctrines of freedom and determinism, the Hindu doctrines of Karma and transmigration of soul, which must be presupposed for each of the systems of philosophy and which it is that solves all knotty problems of the science of morality not to be otherwise explained, regard all acts in the present existence as determined by those in the past, hence the difference observable in many respects between different beings of the earth. Notwithstanding this predominant determinism some sort of freedom of the will of a being must of course be admitted, for otherwise no moral development or religious realisation in any shape would be possible. This self-assertment of the will force even in the face of the highly determining force of previous and present acts and habits is to be understood with reference to the fact already explained viz that though the Jiva by reason of His transgression of deviation from the Absolute Lord's contiguity is enshrouded by the deluding veil of the *Māyā Śakti*, yet a slight touch of the normal state and function of the same Jiva is to be admitted in the theory of Hindu religion, and it is by means of this that the Jiva has got an intuitive belief in the Absolute and hence is inclined, though in a very slight degree, to posit its own natural will-force in the right direction.

The highest end to which these willed acts are adjusted is, as,

we have seen the end of self-realisation. But self-realisation can not be really attained so long as our acts are confined to the phenomenal world. The world in which our moral conduct is displayed is nothing but a sphere of struggle and full of distractions, and consequently impedes that concentration of thought which is necessary for self-realisation. In this sphere of struggle we always feel a consciousness of inadequacy and incompleteness due to the impermanence of the objects and acts that always try to hold a sway upon the mind; and although the fact cannot be denied that in the moral life is to be found a solution of the contradiction between the individual and the universal nature of man, yet such solution is only partial in character in as much as the highest result of morality instead of being an attainment of the Infinite as a positive object of desire is only the endless negation of the finite. We are thus raised to the idea of a sphere of attainment which will acquire a permanent effect upon our mind and secure us permanent happiness. Such being the case, it is quite evident that morality abstracted from religion gives us nothing but impermanence and inadequacy; and if morality is to be crowned with the final end called self-realisation, it must be appended to Religion. In other words, morality must be based upon religion; and because the highest conception of religion lies in the faith in and devotion to the Absolute Being, the greatest development of morality ever goes *pari passu* with such religion as we have described as the cult of devotion.

The close relation between morality and religion is thus to be understood in the sense that it must have a religious and hence metaphysical basis. Accordingly, religion is necessarily involves morality, but not vice versa. This is the key note of all Hindu systems of thought; it runs not only through the strictly philosophical and religious systems, but also through the codes of sacraments and the ethical and didactic

treatises,—even through the systems of medical science and all forms of profane literature. The Codes of Manu, Yājñavalkya and others, for example, while dealing with the duties of mankind in the various stages of life in this world, lay the greatest stress and importance upon that highest duty or dharma which consists in Ātma-jñāna or self-realisation, and distinctly lay down that those sacraments including all moral precepts are to be regarded as but a stepping stone to the Highest Dharma. In the system of medicine, again, we find it clearly stated that healthiness of the body is inseparably connected with that of the mind which again includes all sorts of moral conduct (technically called here Vṛttis), and that such combined healthiness is but a secondary happiness meant only for the real happiness Ātma-jñāna.¹ Further we find that the key note prevailing in the ethical poetry of Indian literature such as the Nṛtisataka, the Chānakya Śāntika, the Nīti Mañjari and others is the doctrine of the vanity of human life which so dominates Indian thought and which stands in such a prominent contrast to true happiness described here as consisting in renunciation and leading a pious anchorite life.

Looking deeper into the question we find that religion is not simply the basis of, but serves as the surest guarantee for, all true morality. This appears if we examine carefully the true

-
1. Cf. सुखसंज्ञकमारोग्यम्—Chāraka Sutrasthana IX, 4, where the Commentator Chakradatta explains the word सुखसंज्ञक thus—“संज्ञकग्रहणात् परमार्थतोऽसुखमपि लोके सुखमिति यद् व्यवहियते तदिह गृह्यते.....तथा संज्ञकग्रहणेन लौकिक सुखं न परमार्थतः सुखमिति दर्शयति—

“The happiness resulting from a healthy body and consequent healthy mind is not really happiness in the absolute sense of the term but is generally described as ‘happiness’ in the phenomenal world.”

implication of the Gītā text—**सर्वधर्मान् परित्यज्य मामेकं शरणं** etc. The meaning of the text is this—“Bhagavān dictates all beings to resort to Him alone even at the sacrifice of all other Dharmas; and He promises that He would save them from all sorts of transgressions. It is here to be noted that while the Śloka states the superiority of the devotional cult over all other Dharmas, it implies at the same time that the cult of devotion being taken to and practised there is not the least fear of any transgression whatsoever; in other words, a devotee to Bhagavān is never inclined in his life to commit any transgression in the shape of violation of all other duties. Now what are the various duties enjoined for a being? An exhaustive enumeration of all the duties is simply impracticable. They may be broadly classified however into three classes from the point of view of the three main life-conceptions, viz (a) the individual, (b) the social, (c) the universal or divine. According to the first, a man's life is his own personality and his life's object or duty is to gratify the desires. According to the second, his life is not limited to his own personality but includes the sum and continuity of many personalities of the family, of the race, of the state; and his life's object is to gratify the will of the communities of individuals. According to the third, his life is confined neither to his personality nor to that of the aggregate of individuals, but finds its significance in the eternal source of all life in Bhagavān Himself. The third is the best meaning of life, and love of God which characterises the true nature of a being is the impelling motive of this life. This life-conception it is that determines the highest duty of a being which duty thus consists in devotional love and servitude to Bhagavān and belongs to the province of religion proper. The duties determined by the first life-conception characterise only the savage and do not come even within the province of morality. Those determined by the second conception belong

to the province of the moral codes. The highest duty again means that which transcends and yet reconciles within itself all other duties, which is not only something other than those other duties but is inclusive of them all. Hence it follows that if one takes recourse to the highest duty as the aim of his life, that is to say, takes to devotion to Bhagavān as the sole function of his own self, the due performance of all other duties—the systematic practice of all acts of true morality will be necessarily implied thereby, but not vice-versa. The fact is conclusively established, therefore, that a religion in the true sense of the term—the cult of devotion as we have sufficiently indicated in the previous pages—is the basis of and guarantee for all kinds of moral acts.

From the above it follows that whereæver there is a true religious spirit i. e. sincere devotion to the Absolute Lord, there cannot but exist all moral qualities and moral excellences. This is what is distinctly stated in the Bhāg. text, so often quoted in the Charitāmṛta—यस्यास्ति भक्तिर्भगवत्पुण्यकिञ्चना सर्वैर्गुणैस्तत्र समासते सुराः । हरावभक्तस्य कुतो महद्गुणा मनोरथेनासति धावतो बह्विहः ॥ (V, 18, 12). What it means is that all good qualities exist in a harmonious way in him who is fervently devoted to Bhagavān, and none is to be found in one who is not devoted, for the latter's mind is ever directed to transient worldly objects. These moral qualities may be enumerated as kindness, absence of hostility even towards the hostile, veracity, equality to all, absence of a fault finding spirit, liberality or benevolence, mildness in nature, purity within and without, non-avarice, doing good to all with one's own ability, forbearance and patience in all acts, control over the senses and passions, vigilance, giving to all their dues without any the least hankering after honour, gravity in nature, sympathy, non-cheating, non-interference in all matters,

the power of influencing others by conduct and precepts. This list evidently includes those four excellent qualities which Lord Gourāṅga emphasised as indispensably necessary for the proper upkeep of the function of a devotee, and thus we come to know from his own couplet cited in the *Charitāmṛta* which has now become an oftquoted maxim and popular aphorism—

तृणादपि सुनीचनं तरेरिव सहिष्णुना

अमानिना मानदेन कीर्त्तनीयः सदा हरिः ॥

The sweet names and auspicious qualities of Hari the Absolute Being should always be cited by one who is more humble than even a blade of grass, patient and forbearing like a tree and ever in the habit of honouring all without any hankering after himself being honoured.

The first mentioned quality of kindness is one of those two cardinal virtues which have been given the most conspicuous place in the moral teachings and precepts of Lord Gourāṅga, the other one being an irresistible passion for the utterance and thought of the sweet names of the Lord which however is more theological than moral. Of these two, the latter is preeminently the cardinal quality, inasmuch as, from the relation already indicated between religion and morality, it appears that a passionate love of the sweet names and auspicious qualities of Bhagavān is that upon which all moral qualities hinge or depend (from *cardo*, a hinge), and hence also kindness to Jīvas as a moral quality must depend upon it. Briefly speaking, without taking recourse to a constant practice of the means of devotion none can possibly acquire a relish for a steady remembrance of the names of Bhagavān, and the mind reduced to such a state will inevitably become the emporium of all moral qualities. Kindness to Jīvas again is also a cardinal virtue, for most of the qualities enumerated above are involved in it, e. g. absence of hostility even to-

wards the hostile, equality to all, absence of a fault-finding spirit, liberality, doing good to all with one's own ability, giving to all their dues without the least hankering after honour, and sympathy, follow feeling etc. As we have already said, kindness or grace is nothing but a change arising within one's mental principle when it is affected by a conscious feeling of the sufferings of other beings.

This external duty of kindness, viz the promotion of happiness is, according to V. philosophy, to be directed towards all sentient beings; and on this point, though it differs from intuitionist moralists who hold that kindly dispositions are to be cultivated towards men only, it agrees with many e. g. the Common-sense moralists, the school of Bentham, and the school of Sidgwick, for these latter hold that the pain of animals is *per se* to be avoided. From this it follows therefore that all beings are to be treated equally, in other words, the maxim of equality to all is to be regarded as a moral excellence based upon the cardinal quality of kindness. Nay, the V. theory goes further and advocates not only the maxim of equality but also the principle of a sense of inferiority to all irrespective of their distinctive features. Hence a devotee cannot but be in the spirit of giving every one else the honour, his due, and, consistently with that disposition, must not himself aspire in the least after fame or honour. This sense of humility lying at the root of a sincerity and fervency in devotion is not to be slighted as a characteristic of the weak and lowly, but is one which crowns all moral excellences fit for touching upon complete self-realisation. Such a man who is ever inclined to honour all cannot possibly be of that vile nature whereby he would unnecessarily find fault with others instead of appreciating their merits. Perfection is indeed denied to phenomenal beings, and hence defects and merits in varied proportion are to be found in each individual; and

whatever height he might have reached in respect of intellectual or moral attainments, there cannot but exist in him defects however small or trifling, and to look to the defects alone being unmindful of the bright side, is simply a meanness beyond measure. Hence consistently with his lofty moral nature the devotee must always be inclined to appreciate the merits of others leaving aside their defects, just in the same way as a honey-sucker tastes the honey only of a flower leaving aside the thorn and rubbishes, or as a swan tastes the milk alone out of a mixture of milk and water. Similarly it follows from the same quality of all-encompassing kindness that a devotee must not act adversely even to those that have done him wrong but should always try to do them good. Revengefulness as a spring of action is always a low propensity and has no place in the sphere of morality. Noble revenge, on the other hand, is always a commendable virtue, and the brightest example thereof was shown by Lord Govrāṅga Himself in-as-much as He parted with his supreme bliss even to those greatest drunkards like Jagāi and Mādihāi who refrained not from hurting the Absolute Lord Himself.

Of the many minor virtues that stand related to the external duty of kindness gift-making is perhaps the most conspicuous. It may roughly be defined as that virtue which being based upon the feeling of kindness is exhibited in the particular service of giving money and the like with the object of promoting the happiness of others. Under this head come liberality and generosity. Although it is a fact that a certain excess is needful on the part of the giver if the duty of liberality is to be well done, yet the theory of the Hindus undoubtedly places the general duty of gift-making within the limits of a strict duty. The great Law-giver Manu, while expatiating on the merits of gift, definitely lays down an injunction binding upon all men that, if asked, everybody

should always give something at least, be it ever so little, without grudging, for a worthy recipient will perhaps be found some time or the other

(cf—यत् किञ्चिदपि दातव्यं यचितेनानसूयया ।

उत्पत्स्यते हि तत् पात्रं यत्तारयति सर्वतः ॥

(Manu, Ch. IV, 228). This duty of liberality appears to require an external abundance in the gift even more than a self-sacrificing disposition of generosity as exhibited by a poor man in a small gift, and hence is confined only to the rich. The admiration that is always accorded to this kind of gift contains an element more æsthetic than moral. The other one, viz. generosity therefore is regarded as purely moral, and the spirit of V. philosophy seems to emphasise this quality for the simple reason that the cult of devotion generally likes to embrace the poorer classes more than the rich. In this connection we might refer to the quality of frugality which has been given an important place in the theologico-moral teachings of Lord Gourāṅga as we come to know from the *Chari-tāmṛta* texts. In the 15th chapter of the *Madhya Līlā* it is stated that Lord Gourāṅga with a view to put a check upon the extravagance of one Vāsudeva Datta instructs through the medium of Śivānanda Sān that being a householder he (Vāsudeva Datta) ought not to indulge in his habit of exhausting all the resources but try to save something for the future maintenance of his relations and dependents. The real significance of such instructions, meant for householders in general, for frugality lies in the fact that thereby they would be in a position to do acts of generosity to worthy recipients besides the proper maintenance of their relations, and by worthy recipients the theory of V. Religion means sincere and earnest devotees. Again, of the various acts of gift or charity, the gift of that supreme joy which is inseparably connected with the sweet names and auspicious qualities of Bhagavān is

regarded here as the best; and on this point it agrees with the view of Manu about the hierarchy of gifts, for it is distinctly laid down in Manu Chapter IV that Brahmādāna or the gift of the Vedas is the best of all acts of charity.

The reference to the maintenance of relations which appears in the above instructions of Lord Gourāṅga as the motive for acquiring the habit of frugality leads us to a consideration of the duties that we owe to others on the basis of relations of personal affection, e. g., the duties of parents towards children and other near relatives, and vice versa. There seems to be a great difference of opinion amongst European moralists as to the question whether these duties based upon personal relationships of affection and love are to be given or not a special kind of consideration in preference to other duties e. g. those arising out of the relationship of citizenship or neighbourhood. According to the theory of V. philosophy, however, some sort of preferential superiority must be unconditionally acknowledged so long as the individual members claiming a near relationship of blood and the like have not yet attained an age of majority and sufficient intelligence to take care of themselves and seek their own welfare. But reaching this stage of life they can claim upon a special kind of preferential treatment from their parents or superiors only if they follow un-grudgingly the sole salutary advice, viz. that their highest duty as rational beings is to be devoted to the Absolute Being Kṛṣṇa both inwardly and outwardly.

One of the important moral attributes of a devotee is, as we have seen, 'veracity' or the duty of truth-speaking. Briefly speaking, it may be defined in the language of Professor S. L. G. Wick as 'consisting in uttering not words which might according to common usage produce in other minds beliefs corresponding to our own, but words which we believe will have this effect on the persons whom we address.' The definition

seems very plausible since the natural function of language is to convey our beliefs to other men and we commonly know quite well whether we are doing this or not. European moralists seem to be puzzled with the question whether veracity is an absolute and independent duty or a special application of some higher principle. Kant regards it as a duty owed to one-self to speak the truth because a lie is an abandonment or, as it were, annihilation of the dignity of man. Understood in the light of V. philosophy this bare statement of Kant would mean that truth-speaking as a duty is quite natural to the intrinsic nature of a rational self or Jiva in-as-much as the latter is a part and parcel of the Absolute Lord one of whose auspicious attributes is truth (cf सत्यं परं धीमहि Bhāg. 1st śloka,

This dignity of being truthful it is not always possible for the Jiva to maintain when he himself being thrown into the foreign sphere of a corporeal frame is acted and re-acted upon by similar environments. If, therefore, under such altered circumstances the individual being deviates from the natural function of truth-speaking, such deviation or what is called here a lie would necessarily be regarded as a temporary abandonment by the being of its own dignity, though not a strict annihilation, and the abandonment will be abandoned if the Jiva takes recourse to the cult of Bhakti. From the relation, again, in which the individual being stands to the Absolute, this duty of veracity cannot evidently be regarded as an absolute or independent duty but one which is conditioned by the existence of the Absolute as the Immanent Regulator in the heart of all beings. If, again, the expression 'absolute and independent' be taken in Kant's own sense, that is to say, if the duty of truth-speaking is regarded by Kant as a categorical imperative binding upon all under all circumstances and irrespectively of the consequences thereof, then a new question arises—'Is truth-speaking as a duty to be regarded as a catego-

rial imperative, or are there any exceptions and qualifications put upon it? On this point a class of European moralists, while advocating the latter alternative, say that 'though an attempt should always be made to regard the duty of veracity as a moral maxim, still, so far as the affairs of the actual world are concerned, the rule of veracity cannot be elevated into a definite moral axiom and hence there are circumstances under which even a lie is allowable'. As instances of such exceptional cases we find it stated in ethical treatises, e. g. Sidgwick's *Method of Ethics*, that in the word-contest of law courts the lawyer is commonly held to be justified in untruthfulness within strict rules and limits, that it may sometimes be right for persons to speak falsely to an invalid if this seems the only way of concealing facts (e. g. the death news of a certain near relative of the invalid) that might produce a dangerous shock, and so on. A similar view is also held in the *Rhāg. text*—**स्त्रीषु नर्मविवाहे च वृत्त्यर्थे प्राणसंकटे । गोब्राह्मणार्थे हिंसायां नानृतं स्याज्जगुप्सितम् ॥ VIII, 20, 43**). In other words, falsehood is not a moral guilt in the following cases, viz. (1) towards one's wife, (2) at the time of marriage, (3) on the occasion of an amusement or fun, (4) for the sake of a livelihood, (5) when the life is at stake, (6) for the sake of a Brahmin (meaning here any man who by reason of his religious advancement and consequent noble qualities of the head and the heart has reached a very high stage in life) or of a cow, (7) in the matter of a violence, that is, for the purpose of dissuading one from an act of violence. Of these, the cases 1, 2, 3 and the latter portion of 6 might not be convincing to many severe thinkers and moralists, but the other cases cannot be ignored altogether. The real significance however that underlies these cases is that a lie in the shape of *suppresio veri* or *suggestio falsi* might be allowable when the object of desire is a noble

one. Indeed in the system of the moral teachings and precepts of Lord Gourāṅga as laid down in the *Charitāmṛta* there is no clear reference to these exceptions to the stringent rule of veracity, but the clear statement in the *Bhāg.* text cited above makes up this omission and decidedly establishes our point at issue. At any rate, according to the view of thinkers both Indian and European, the stringent rule of veracity may be violated under certain extreme circumstances in the sphere of religion as well as in the sphere of mundane affairs.

Turning next to the quality of control over the senses and passions, we find that it occupies a most conspicuous place in all the systems of Indian Philosophy—none the less so in the system of Vaisnavism. All scriptural texts emphatically enjoin that since the ten senses and *manas* (the internal organ) are ever prone towards transient worldly objects, attempts should always be made to withdraw them from those objects in order that a state of composure might be effected towards a steady realisation of the Absolute Lord. In this connection it is to be specially noted that that organ of action which is an instrumentality for the satisfaction of animal passions must be controlled by all means. An indiscreet inadvertence in this respect it is which on the part of many a so called follower of the devotional cult in the present days has unfortunately brought such a great stigma upon the most sublime religion of the Hindus. The serious havoc which, as already indicated, is very often being wrought by these so-called followers of the cult in the name of *Rāgānugā* is, if I am allowed to say so, pivoted upon this gross abuse of the senses. Hence it is that Lord Gourāṅga has laid the greatest stress upon this amongst all moral attributes. On one occasion during the *Prakata Līlā* of Śrī Gourāṅga, one younger *Haridāsa*, one of His adherents, purchased rice from one Śikhi *Māhiti*'s sister who was then regarded a devotee and moralist

of the first order. For this simple act of speaking a word or so to that woman of astounding morality the adherent Hari-dāsa, himself a personality of spotless character, was highly rebuked and turned away by Lord Gourāṅga saying—(Prabhu kahe) Vairāṅgi kare prakṛti sambhāṣaṇa | Dekhite nāṁāri āmi tāhāra vadana || Durvāra indriya kare viṣayagrahaṇa | Dāru prakṛti hare muni janera mana || तथाहि—मात्रा स्वस्त्रा दुहित्वा वा नाविविकासनो भवेत् । बलवान् इन्द्रियग्रामो विद्वांसमपि कर्षति || (Manu, II, 215). Kṣandra Jiva markāṭa vairāṅgya kariyā | Indriya charāṇā vulo prakṛti sambhāṣiyā || (Antya Līlā, ch. 11). "The devotee that speaks to a woman is most disliked and hated by the Lord since the senses are so very potent in distracting and diverting the mind away that even a wooden toy of female form perturbs even an ascetic's tranquil mind. So it is well said in Manu—Let not one occupy a seat very close even to one's mother, sister or daughter, for the senses are powerful even in agitating the mind of a sage". Such being the case, it can be fairly imagined how extremely detestable and highly immoral is the act of illegal cohabitation with a woman of any rank. This act however is regarded immoral by all systems of philosophy and by all moral codes in all countries. But the distinctive feature of the philosophy of V. religion—nowhere else to be found—is that a man is forbidden to make cohabitation even with his legally-wedded wife. On this important point we might refer to the instruction, given by Lord Gourāṅga to Sanātana Goswāmī about the conduct of a devotee, as contained in the lines—Asatsangatyāga ei vaiṣṇava āchāra strisangī eka asādhū Kṛṣṇābhakta āra ei sava tyāji āra varṇāśrama dharma | ukiūchana haiyā laya Kṣṇera śaraya || (Charitāmṛta Madhya, ch. XXII). The expression स्त्री सङ्गी has been interpreted by some to mean 'one who cohabits with another's

wife'. This meaning being accepted, it might follow by way of implication as if this conduct is forbidden in V. religion but sanctioned in other sectarian religions. But a review of all the current sects of religion prevailing amongst civilized nations would disprove the latter fact. Hence the interpretation of the text here would be that a devotee according to the system of V. Religion is strictly forbidden to cohabit even with his own wife, far be it said of the illegal cohabitation with other's wives—other women so to say. This meaning is corroborated by

a number of Bhāg. texts. viz—(1) न तथास्य भवेत् क्लेशो बन्धश्चान्यप्रसङ्गतः । योपित्सङ्गाद् यथा पुंसो यथा तत्सङ्गिसङ्गतः ॥

(XI, 14, 30 & III, 3135) "No other association or companionship can bring upon a man such delusion and bondage as is effected by association with women in general (it matters not if the woman be one's own lawfully married wife or not) or with those that make such companionship"; (2) सत्यं शौच दया मौनं बुद्धिर्हीनः श्रैर्यशः क्षमा । शमो दमो भगश्चेति यत्सङ्गाद् याति संक्षयम् ॥ तेष्वश्वस्तेषु मूढेषु खण्डितात्मस्त्वसाधुषु । सङ्गं न कुर्याच्छोच्येषु योपित्क्रीडामृगेषु ॥ (III, 31, 33-34). in which the last

word means 'those that take delight in the company of women,' and the sense of the texts is that all excellent attributes, viz. truthfulness, purity, kindness etc. are lost by cohabitation with a woman or with those that are of this conduct; (3)

सङ्गं न कुर्यात् प्रमदासु जातु योगस्य पारं परमावरुक्षुः । सत्सेवया प्रतिलब्धात्मलाभो वदन्ति या निरयद्वारमस्य ॥ (III, 31, 29) which

prohibits association with all प्रमदा's which word again has been explained by Jiva Goswāmī and Viśwa Nātha Chakravartī to mean all women including lawfully-wedded wives

(प्रमदासु स्वीयास्वपिः ।) (4) स्त्रीणां स्त्रीसङ्गिनां सङ्गं त्यक्त्वा
 दूरत आत्मवान् । क्षेपे विदित्वा आसीनश्चिन्तयेन् मामतन्द्रितः ॥
 (XI, 14, 29): (5) तस्मान् सङ्गो न कर्तव्यः स्त्रीषु स्त्रीषु चेत्ययैः ।
 (XI, 27, 24). Besides the sense-control thus indicated, res-
 traint of the six-fold passions also constitutes a distinctive mo-
 ral attribute. These passions are enumerated in Hindu scrip-
 tures as kâma or desire (for secular enjoyments), ire or anger
 avarice, delusions, vanity and jealousy. Their nature is to
 turn the mind away from spiritual concentration and ulti-
 mately to reduce it to that vitiated state in which there would
 be no difference between reason and unreason. Hence for
 the ultimate good of a human being they must always be
 tempered with devotional spirit and guided in such a way
 that their gross nature would at last be completely changed
 into a supreme one. And at this stage their significance
 would be—(1) desire not for one's own sensuous pleasure but
 for the supreme pleasure of Kṛṣṇa, (2) anger towards those
 that are averse to the devotional worship of Kṛṣṇa, (3) greed
 for partaking of the remnants of the worship of Kṛṣṇa, (4)
 delusiveness resulting in a state of mental despondency which
 is caused not by the attainment of earthly prosperity and
 splendour but by that of even a small bit of the supreme plea-
 sure consisting in devotional worship, (6) Jealousy directed
 towards those that have already advanced more than one's
 ownself in respect of religious realisation.

THE HIGHEST CONCEPTION OF MORALITY ACCORDING TO V. PHILOSOPHY.

In the previous pages having indicated the nature of mo-
 rality in its relation to religion, we made an enumeration
 and explication of some of the important moral attributes
 which are the inevitable consequence of steadfast devotion to

the Absolute Being Bhagavān. We also referred to some of the important moral precepts and teachings of Lord Gourāṅga so far as can be gathered from the authoritative texts on the subject. Amongst these moral qualities the most cardinal one has been stated to be kindness towards Jīvas, where the term Jīva according to V. theory is not restricted to mankind alone but means all created beings from Brahmā the highest downwards to a blade of grass the lowest in rank. From the meaning of the word 'kindness' already explained, viz. that it is a conscious feeling within one's mind of the sufferings of others, it appears that the most natural implication of this moral quality is service to the whole creation. To this lofty idea of morality there is a clear reference in the Bhāg. texts, and the same has attained further development in the Chari-tamṛta and other allied texts that deal specifically with the Gourāṅga cult. The Bhāg. text runs thus—**शिवाय लोकस्य भवाय भूतये य उक्तमश्नोऽकपरायणा जनाः । जीवन्ति नात्मार्थमसौ पराश्रयं मुमोच निर्विच कुतः कलेवरम् ॥** (I, 4, 12). The verse refers to the question why Rājā Parikṣit, a great devotee to Kṛṣṇa, by reason of his severe asceticism and the consequent averseness to mundane objects, was inclined to sacrifice his own life by way of fasting in penance on the bank of the Ganges. Without entering into the answer to this question which is so elaborately stated and discussed in the Bhāgavata, all that we are concerned with here is that according to the view of the Bhāgavata the object of life of a great devotee is not confined to his own personality, nor to the family, the society, the race, the state, but includes the persistent thought about the continuity and all-sided good of the whole creation. This idea of universal good and service far surpasses in respect of fullness and richness of the content that of service to humanity which characterises the conception of religion in the Positive Philosophy of Comte. Based upon the social life

conception already explained, Comte's theory of morality relating to the service of humanity is open to many serious objections which requires a careful examination of the theory. Now it is a patent fact admitted by all that the characteristic basis of a religion is the existence of a Power without us so superior to ourselves as to command the complete submission of our whole life. This basis, according to Comte, is to be found in the positive stage in humanity past, present and to come, conceived as the Great Being. "A deeper study of the great universal order reveals to us at length the ruling power within it of the true Great Being whose destiny it is to bring that order continually to perfection by constantly conforming to its laws, and which thus best represents to us that system as a whole. This undeniable Providence, the supreme dispenser of our destinies, becomes in the natural course the common centre of our affections, our thoughts, and our actions. Although this great Being evidently exceeds the utmost strength of any, even of any collective human force, its necessary constitution and its peculiar function endow it with the truest sympathy towards all its servants. The best amongst us can and ought constantly to aspire to maintain and even to improve this Being. This natural object of all our activity, both public and private, determines the true general character of the rest of our existence, whether in feeling or in thought, which must be devoted to love and to know in order rightly to serve our Providence by a wise use of all the means which it furnishes to us. Reciprocally this continued service whilst strengthening our true unity renders us at once both happier and better."

The doctrine of the love and service of humanity which is contained in the above lines has for its basis the social life conception already explained. The vagueness in character and content of this idea of humanity has been so vividly ex-

pressed by Count Tolstoi that we cannot but refer here to his criticism on the point. "The essence of the social life conception," says Mr. Tolstoi, "consists in replacing the sense of individual life by that of the life of the group. In its first step, this is a simple and natural progression as from the family to the race is more difficult and requires special education—which has arrived at its utmost limits when the state has been reached."

"It is natural for every man to love himself and he needs no incentive thereto, to love his tribe which lends both support and protection; to love his wife.....his parents..... all this, although not so intense as love of self, is natural and common to mankind "

"To love one's race, one's people, for their own sake, although not so instinctive, is also common. To love one's ancestors, one's kinsfolk, is also natural and frequent.....and yet the Positivists and all the preachers of the scientific fraternity, not taking into consideration the fact that this feeling is weakened in proportion to the expansion of its object, continue to theorise on the same lines. They say—'if it were to the advantage of an individual to transfuse his consciousness into the family and thence into the nation and the state, it follows that it will be to his further advantage to transfuse his consciousness into the universal entity, mankind, that all men may live for humanity as they have lived for the family and for the state.'

"And theoretically they are right. After having transferred the consciousness and love for the individual to the family and from the family to the race, the nation and the state, it would be perfectly logical for men, in order to escape the strife and disasters that result from the division of mankind into nations and states, to transfer their love to humanity at large. This would appear to be the logical outcome,

and it has been offered as a theory by those who forget that love is an innate sentiment which can never be inspired by preaching, that it must have a real object, and that the entity which they call humanity is not a real object but a fiction". "The man who loves humanity, what is it that he loves? There is a state, there is a people, there is the abstract conception of man. But humanity as a concrete conception is impossible. Humanity? Where is its limit? Where does it end and where does it begin? Does it exclude the savage, the idiot, the inebriate, the insane? If one were to draw a line of demarcation so as to exclude the lower representatives of the human race, where ought it to be drawn? Ought it to exclude the Negro as they do in the United States, or the Hindoos as some Englishmen do, or the Jews as does another nation. But if we include all humanity without exception, why should we restrict ourselves to men? Why should we exclude the higher animals some of whom are superior to the lowest representatives of the human race? We do not know humanity in the concrete nor can we fix its limits. Humanity is a fiction and therefore it cannot be loved."

Indeed Mr. Tolstoi is quite right, and we may say, unapproachable in the above argument. And he says all this in his noble attempt at an exposition of the true theory of Christian Morality. The same argument however applies with greater force to the conception of morality as involved in the Bhagvata text cited above and as developed further in later texts of a similar nature. The serious blunder of the Positive Philosopher whereby he falls into such inextricable fallacies lies in his ill-chosen selection of the social life conception and in the sad ignorance of the fact that the highest conception of morality must have a solid and a clearly-defined foundation in the human soul, whereas love of humanity is but a theoretical conclusion reached through analogy." As we have already said, accord-

ing to the Vaiṣṇava theory the true nature and function of an individual soul or Jīva consists in bliss and love which is but a bit of the infinite Bliss and Love of Bhagavān Kṛṣṇa. This loving attribute therefore ever exists in the Jīva as its innate characteristic and manifested primarily and naturally in the shape of servitude towards the eternal love of Bhagavān. This divine love and servitude again cannot posit itself unless it is manifested simultaneously towards the whole creation which is ever pervaded by the All-pervading Being. Thus the highest conception of morality which consists in the love and service to the whole creation is entirely based upon the divine life conception already referred to. Even if for argument's sake we accept the Positivist's theory, we must say that an infallible doctrine of love of humanity is tenable, that the love of humanity would follow as a matter of course and flow spontaneously and invariably—only when the loving subject, the individual soul, has its sole function based upon the Absolute Being—the Eternal Source of all love.

In other words, the essence of the individual soul being love, its well-being may be traced not to the fact that it loves this object or that one, but to the fact that it loves the Principle of all things—God, whom it realises through love and will by the love of God love all men and all things. The only point to be specially noted here is that the foundation of true morality must be well-chosen, that the divine life conception, the best of all life-conceptions, must be regarded as the basis of all true morality in the highest sense of the term. And if that is done, there would be no objection about the term 'humanity', the more because, according to the theory of creation as involved in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa and Manu texts, the concept of humanity is not restricted to mankind alone but to the whole body of created beings.

The doctrine about the love and service to humanity

(where 'humanity' is to be taken in the sense of the whole creation) being thus clearly established as the tone of the highest morality, the next question arises "How could such love be fostered in the heart of beings? What, in other words, should be the true nature of a being's conduct with regard to others of the family, the society, the race, the state?" To answer this vital question we are forced to refer to the most vital point in the present politics in India. Although ours is not a political treatise, yet we cannot ignore the fact that in the sphere of Indian literature no sharp line of demarcation can be drawn between the department of religion and all other departments: in other words, Politics, Morals, Socialism, Commerce, in a word, all that has to do with conscience must have a religious basis—must be religion. The principle of non-violent non-cooperation, we may add here, occupies the most prominent place in the present sphere of Indian politics. Of the two concepts of non-violence and non-cooperation, the latter has no place in the system of Vaishnava religion; rather, the principle of non-cooperation, unless it be taken in a restricted sense, is highly antagonistic to the true spirit of Vaishnavism. The principle of non-violence or non-resistance, on the other hand, has been accorded a most conspicuous place in the system of Vaisnav Philosophy as also in the theories of Christianity and Islamism; and as such, it is indeed necessary and not out of the place that we should give a detailed account of this principle.

As to the genesis of the principle it might be said that since its basis is soul-force and since the soul as a positive entity is explicitly manifest in a human being, it is as old as the human race. Yet for various reasons the principle has not attained the same development every where: in India, for example, it was realised and practised long before it came into vogue in Europe and is still prevailing there in a prominent

way. In India, again, the principle holds good in a preeminent degree in the Bhakti cult although it occupies not an insignificant place in the other cults as well. Now what is this non-violence? It is nothing but the Ahimsā principle occupying such a prominent place in the Gītā and all other scriptural texts, it is the idea which is expressed so lucidly in Indian philosophy by the expression "freedom from injury to every living thing". The principle consists in holding and asserting relations towards all beings, being guided not by force nor by the sword but by non-resistance to evil, by humanity, meekness and the love of peace.

We have already shown how this doctrine of non-violence constitutes one of the most essential factors in the moral precepts and teachings of Lord Gourāṅga. In His aphoristic utterance *तृणादपि सुनीचेन* etc. the quality of 'forbearance like a tree' indicated by the expression *तरोरिव सहिष्णुना* undoubtedly involves the spirit of non-violence. The greatest violence in the shape of total destruction of the life is used against the tree and yet the tree gladly returns this greatest evil by a very great good, viz. affording shelter under its cool and refreshing shadow. The only lesson we get from this moral precept is that we should never use any violence towards any being, but always try to return even the greatest evil by good. Lord Gourāṅga, we know, appeared with the sole object of granting beatific joy to all beings, and He fulfilled this mission solely by taking recourse to the principle of non-violence. Indeed the differentia of the concept of Gourāṅga lies in the fact that in all His acts He absolutely refrained from using any violence however small towards any being whatsoever. The brightest example of this spirit we find illustrated in the way in which Lord Gourāṅga extended His loving influence even towards the most obdurate, the greatest drunkard, the vilest of all—I mean, the two brothers Jagāi

and Mādhāi. Always intoxicated tipsi tarvo, the most vitiated in character, these two brothers did not hesitate in the least from using all sorts of violence against the Absolute Being incarnate, they went so far as to pelt at Him, to throw stones against him so as to cause a profuse blood-shed, yet all this could not perturb in the least the Loving God of the Vaisnavas. He embraced them most cordially and returned the vilest evil not by any violence in the shape of sword or the like, but by the immediate grant of the greatest good which consists in Prema. And so we have said not unjustly that a brighter example of the spirit of non-violence is never to be met with in the world's history of religion and morality.

This principle of non-violence may thus fairly be described as the highest esoteric teaching of Lord Gourāṅga, intended for the good of mankind. And, besides the wholesome utterances in authoritative texts about its unqualified admissibility, there are many good reasons to accept it as such. In this connection we might refer conveniently to the following statement quoted in Mr. Tolstoi's—"The kingdom of God is within you," p. 8-9—"The history of mankind is crowded with evidences proving that physical coercion is not adapted to moral regeneration, that the sinful disposition of man can be subdued only by love; that evil can be exterminated from the earth only by goodness, that it is not safe to rely upon an arm of flesh, upon man whose breath is his nostrils, to preserve us from harm; that there is great security in being gentle, harmless, long suffering and abundant in mercy; that it is only the meek who shall inherit the earth for the violent who resort to the sword are destined to perish with the sword. Hence, as a measure of sound policy of safety to property, life and liberty—of public quietude and private enjoyment, as well as on the ground of allegiance to Him who is King of Kings and Lord of Lords, we cordially

adopt the non-resistance principle, being confident that it provides for all possible consequences, will insure all things needful to us, is armed with omnipotent power, and must ultimately triumph over ever-assailing force."

Such being the great merit of the principle of non-violence, it is no doubt desirable that instead of being confined to Indian minds alone it should prevail throughout the whole world so that there might take place universal peace and harmony and total absence of all sorrow. And it is a delight to find that this lofty theologico-moral principle has happily begun gradually to become the world-spirit of the present day. We must not hesitate to state here that the teachings of Lord Christ have contributed in no less degree towards the prevalence of this world spirit; and for a clear exposition of this principle as a very prominent factor in the moral precepts and teachings of Lord Christ the sole credit is due to the political saint Count Tolstoi. Now it is a patent fact as true as anything in mathematics that the Christian doctrine is the doctrine of truth as well as of prophecy. This doctrine which reveals to mankind the true conduct of life, is to be found in the genuine form and in its true meaning only in the Sermon on the Mount in the New Testament. Such importance of the Sermon cannot therefore be denied, for, according to the view of Mr. Tolstoi, Christ himself, having taught in the Sermon on the Mount these precepts by which men should order their daily lives, said—"Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock and the rain descended and the floods came and the floods came.....and it fell not. And every one that heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them not shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand, and the rain descended.....and the great was the fall" (Mathew VII, 24-27) In this sermon

for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also". "Love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you that ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven". "Transgressions are to be avenged by transgressions, murder by murder, torture by torture, evil by evil" Thus taught Noah, Moses and the prophets. But Christ forbids all this. The Gospel says, 'I say unto you, resist ye not evil, avenging not one transgression by another, but rather bear a repetition of the offence from the evil doer'. (The Kingdom of God is within you—p 16). "The chief significance of this doctrine of non-resistance", says Mr. Tolstoi, "is to show that it is possible to extirpate evils from one's own heart as well as from that of one's neighbour. This doctrine forbids men to do that which perpetuates and multiplies evil in this world. He who attacks another and does an injury excites a feeling of hatred, the worst of all evils. To offend our neighbour, because he has offended us, with the ostensible motive of self-defence, means but to repeat the evil act against him as well as against ourselves—it means to breed, or at least to let loose, or to encourage the evil spirit whom we wish to expel. Satan cannot be driven out by Satan, falsehood cannot be purged by falsehood, nor can evil be conquered by evil. True non-resistance is the only real method of resisting evil. It crushes the serpent's head. It destroys and exterminates all evil feeling" (The kingdom of God is within you—p. 17-18).

The lofty moral virtue thus commanded and taught by Christ is in no way different from what is depicted in the Hindu scriptures from time immemorial and what was displayed and taught in a most successful and profitable manner by Lord Gourāṅga. Whatever the genesis might be and apart

from the question of precedence in inculcating, the fact is that the very genial and harmonising influence of this lofty virtue has been gradually gaining ground in Europe and America chiefly through the medium of the writings of Count Tolstoi (influenced he might be also by the Hindu scriptural texts on this point just in the same way as the German Philosopher Schopenhauer was admittedly influenced by the Vedānta system of Philosophy) and subsequently through the preachings of his disciples. In Africa as well as in India, again, immediately influenced by the writings of Tolstoi but remotely, I should say, by the Gītā and other Hindu Scriptural texts, Mr. Gandhi, another political saint of the modern times, has of late been practising and preaching the same principle of non-violence—the principle which though taught and impressed upon Indian minds by the sayings of the Bhāgavata and other allied texts, was so long lying in a dormant state owing to various adverse circumstances. “I remember”, said Mr. Gandhi, “how once verse of a Gujarati poem, which, as a child, I learned at school, clung to me. In substance it was this—‘If a man gives you a drink of water and you give him a drink in return, that is nothing. Real beauty consists in doing good against evil.’ The advantages of soul force, the basis of this principle, as against physical force are well pictured by Gandhi in the following words—“Passive resistance is an all-sided sword; it can be used any how, it blesses him who uses it and him against whom it is used, without drawing a drop of blood; it produces far-reaching results. It never rusts and cannot be stolen; competition between passive resisters does not exhaust them. The sword of passive resistance does not require a scabbard, and one cannot be forcibly dispossessed of it.” As to the cosmopolitan efficaciousness of this principle Mr. Gandhi says that it is not only useful to Hindus but should be alike embraced by Musalmans, Sikhs, Parsis, Christians,

Jews and all other nations.

It is to be carefully noted in this connection that the above reference to the non-violence principle of Tolstoi and Gandhi has nothing to do with the pure politics of the world. It is here indicated simply because it has a decisive religious basis and is itself a moral excellence inseparably connected with the doctrine of love of the whole creation. These two inseparable factors in morality constitute the salient features in the teachings of Lord Gourāṅga. And because the lofty teachings of the Love God of the Vaiṣnavas are now on the verge of being concretely realised throughout the world, we are in a position to say that the prediction of Gourāṅga that the whole world would be overflowed with the streams of supreme happiness and love, is going to be fulfilled. In this sense again we can also assert that the Goudiṣya Vaiṣnava sect is capable of becoming the universal religion and that a foreshadow of the concrete realisation of this fact is forthcoming. I say foreshadow, for literally speaking, the peace and happiness resulting from the love of humanity and the principle of non-violence, though it might appropriately be described as the best of all happinesses in the phenomenal world, is, on account of its very contact with the phenomenal objects, but a shadow of that supreme bliss which is the concomitant consequence of the summum bonum of Vaiṣnava Philosophy, and for granting which to His own beings Lord Gourāṅga manifested Himself in the Kali age. And so we can conclude our treatise in no better way than by saying—

अनर्पितचरीं चिरान् करुणयावतीर्णः कलौ
समर्पयितुमुद्यताञ्जलरसां स्वभक्तिश्रियम् ।
हरिः पुण्डसुन्दरो द्युतिकदम्बसन्दीपितः
सदा हृदयकन्दरे स्फुरतु वः शचीनन्दनः ॥

(Vidagdhamādhava by Rūpa Goswāmī, I, 2.)

“Let the Delighter of Śācī (Gourāṅga) ever manifest

Himself in the recess of your heart—Gourāṅga who is no other than Hari the Absolute Being, whose complexion is bright and charming like gold, who is ever shining resplendent with the (unsurpassable) heap of supreme lustre, and who out of compassion appeared in the Kali age simply with the object of granting (to beings) the treasuretrove—Bhakti (servitude to Himself) which consists of the highest development of the supreme sentiment (Śrīgāra) and which had not been granted by any other being for a long time previous.”

APPENDIX.

Appendix.

On this point compare the following texts—

(a) अजस्य नाभावध्येकमर्षितं यस्मिन् विश्वानि भुवनानि तस्थुः

Śruti text cited in Mādhwa bhāṣya, p. 7.

p. 8, l 17. (b) यं कामये तं तमुग्रं कृणोमि तं ब्रह्माणं तमृषिं तं सु-

मेधाम् text related to the समाख्या श्रुति परो दिवा परत्र ना पृथिव्या and explained by Madhwāchāryya as referring to Viṣṇu the Highest Being

(c) वेदे रामायणे चैव पुराणे भारते तथा । आदावन्ते च मध्ये च विष्णुः सर्वत्र गीयते ॥ Harivaṃśa text cited in Mādhwa-bhāṣya, p. 7.

(d) परो हि पुरुषो विष्णुस्तस्मान् मोक्षस्ततः स्मृतः Padma-purāṇa text cited in Madhwabhāṣya p. 14.

(e) अनन्तो भगवान् ब्रह्म आनन्देत्यादिभिः पदैः प्रोच्यते विष्णु-रेवैकः परेषामुपचारतः Brahma-purāṇa text cited in Mādhwabhāṣya p. 24.

(f) विष्णु मेवानन्दयन् देवाः विष्णुं भूतिमुपासते । स एव सर्व-वेदोक्तस्तद् रथो देह उच्यते ॥ Skanda text cited in Mādhwabhāṣya p. 28.

(g) ब्रह्मशब्दः परे विष्णौ नान्यत्र कचिदिष्यते । असम्पूर्णाः परे यस्मादुपचारेण वा भवेत् ॥ cited in Mādhwa bhāṣya p. 17.

In the 'Chhā' text cited the word akāśa referring to Brahma really means 'Self-luminous'; yet the word is generally used in the sense of ether. Hence by the statement 'Śabda-Brahman is akāśa' is to be understood that It pervades the infinite ether.

पुरा तपश्चचारोग्रममराणां पितामहः । आविर्भूतास्ततो वेदाः

सप्तङ्गपदक्रमाः ॥ ततः पुराणमखिलं सर्वशास्त्रमयं

P 13 / 13. ध्रुवम् । नित्यशब्दमयं पुण्यं शतकोटिप्रविस्तरम् ॥ नि-

र्गतं ब्रह्मणो वक्त्रात्तस्य भेदान्निबोधत । ब्राह्म्यं पुराण-

मित्यादि Skandha Prabhāsakhaṇḍa text cited in Tattva Sandarbha p. 7. कार्णश्च पञ्चमं वेदं यन्महाभारतं स्मृतम् bhavān-
purāṇa text cited in T. Sandarbha p. 8

इतिहासपुराणानां वक्तांरं सम्यगेव हि । माश्चैव प्रतिजग्राह भग-
वान् ईश्वरः प्रभुः । एक आसीद् यजुर्वेदस्तं चतुर्द्धा व्यकल्पयत् ।

चातुर्होत्रमभूत्तस्मिंस्तेन यज्ञमकल्पयत् ॥ आध्वर्यवं
P. 14, l 2 यजुर्भिस्तु ऋगभिर्होत्रं तथैव च । आद्गात्रं नामभि-
श्चैव ब्रह्मत्वञ्चाथर्वभिः ॥ आख्यानंश्चाप्युपाख्यानं गीथा-
भिर्द्विजसत्तमाः । पुराणसंहिताश्च के पुराणार्थविशारदः ॥ यच्छ्रुष्टु
यजुर्वेदे इति शास्त्रार्थनिर्णयः ।—वायुपुराणे सूतवाक्यम्, quoted in
T. Sandarbha pp. 8 9

चतुर्लक्षप्रमाणेन द्वापरे द्वापरे सदा । तदष्टादशधा कृत्वा भूलो
P. 14, l 13. केऽस्मिन् प्रभाष्यते ॥ अद्याप्यमर्त्तलोके तु शतकोटि
प्रविस्तरम् । तदर्थोऽत्र चतुर्लक्षः संक्षेपेण निवेशितः ॥
Matsyapurāṇa texts cited in T. Sandarbha p. 9

संक्षिप्य चतुरंगे वेदांश्चतुर्द्धा व्यभजत् प्रभुः । व्यस्तवेदतया ख्या-
P. 14, l 24. तो वेदव्यास इति स्मृतः ॥ पुराणमपि संक्षिप्तं चतुर्लक्ष-
प्रमाणतः । अद्याप्यमर्त्तलोके तु शतकोटिप्रविस्तरम् ।
Sivapurāṇa texts cited in T. Sandarbha p. 9.

✓ द्वैपायनेन यद्वुद्धं ब्रह्माद्यैस्तत्र बुध्यते । सर्व्ववुद्धं स वै वेद
P. 16, l 9. तद् बुद्धं नान्यगोचरम् ॥ Padmapurāṇa text cited
in T. Sandarbha P. 10

वेदार्थादधिकं मन्ये पुराणार्थं वगनने । वेदाः प्रतिष्ठिताः सर्व्वे
P. 18, l 6. पुराणे नात्र संशयः ॥ Nāradya text cited in T. San-
darbha P. 11.

वेदवन्निश्चलं मन्ये पुराणार्थं द्विजोत्तमाः । वेदाः प्रतिष्ठिताः
सर्व्वे पुराणे नात्र संशयः ॥ विभेन्यल्पश्रुताद् वेदां मामयं
P. 18, l 29. चालयिष्यति । इतिहासपुराणैस्तु निश्चलाऽयं कृतः
पुरा ॥ यज्ञ दृष्टं हि वेदेषु तद् दृष्टं स्मृतिषु द्विजाः ।
उभयोर्यज्ञ दृष्टं हि तत् पुराणेः प्रगीयते ॥ यो वेदं चतुरंगे वेदान्

साङ्गोपनिषदो द्विजाः । पुराणं नैव जानाति न च स स्याद् विचक्षणः ॥
Skanda-prabhāsa khaṇḍa texts cited in T. Sandarbha pp. 11-12

पञ्चाङ्गञ्च पुराणं स्यादाख्यानमितरम् स्मृतम् । सात्त्विकेषु च
कल्पेषु माहात्म्यमधिकं हरेः ॥ राजसेषु च माहात्म्यमधिकं
P. 19, l 3. ब्रह्मणो विदुः । तद्वदग्रेषु माहात्म्यं नामसेषु शिवस्य च ॥
Matsya-purāṇa texts cited in T. Sandarbha P. 12.

As to the definition of the Bhāgavata purāṇa compare
the following texts—(a) अर्थोऽयं ब्रह्ममूत्राणां

P. 22, l 11. भागवार्थविनिर्णयः । गायत्रीभाष्यरूपोऽसौ वेदार्थ
परिवृद्धितः ॥ पुराणानां सामरूपः साक्षाद् भगवतोदितः ।

द्वादशस्कन्धयुक्तोऽयं शतवर्चच्छेदसंयुतः । ग्रन्थोऽष्टादशसाहस्रः
श्रीमद्भागवतामिवः ॥ Garuḍa purāṇa texts cited in T. Sandar-
bha p. 15; (b) यत्राधिकृत्य गायत्रीं वर्ण्यते धर्मविस्तरः । वृत्रासुर-

वधोपेतं तद् भागवतमिष्यते ॥ अष्टादशसहस्राणि पुराणं तत्
प्रकीर्तितम् । Matsya-purāṇa texts cited in T. Sandarbha p. 13,

(c) ग्रन्थोऽष्टादशसाहस्रो द्वादशस्कन्धसम्मितः । द्वयग्रीवब्रह्मविद्या
यत्र वृत्रवधस्तथा । गायत्र्या च समारम्भस्तद् वै भागवतं विदुः ॥
Skanda texts cited in T. Sandarbha p. 14.

Regarding the interpretation of the first śloka compare
the following extracts from the Param. Sandar-

P. 23, l 8. bha texts pp 283-296 —परं धीमहीति । परं श्रीभ-

गवन्तं धीमहि ध्यायेम तदेवं मुक्तप्रग्रहयायोगवृत्त्या
बृहत्वाद् ब्रह्म यत् सर्व्वात्मकं तद् ब्रह्म भवति । तत्तु निजरश्म्या-
दिभ्यः सूर्य्य इव सर्व्वेभ्यः परमेव स्वतो भवतीति मूलरूपत्वप्रदर्शनाय
परपदेन ब्रह्मपदं व्याख्यायते । तच्चात्र भगवानेवेत्यभिमतम् । पुरुषस्य
तद् शब्वाग्निर्गुणस्य ब्रह्मणो गुणादिहीनत्वात् । उक्तञ्च श्रीरामानुजच-
रणैः सर्व्वत्र बृहत्त्वगुणयोगेन हि ब्रह्मशब्दः । बृहत्त्वञ्च स्वरूपेण
गुणैश्च यत्नानवधिकातिशयः सोऽस्य मुख्योऽर्थः । स च सर्व्वेश्वर
पवेति । अत्र जिज्ञासेत्यस्य व्याख्या धीमहीति । यतस्तज्जिज्ञासाया
स्तात्पर्य्यं तद्व्याख्यान एव । तदुक्तमेकादशे स्वयं भगवता—शब्दब्रह्मणि

निष्णातो न निष्णायात् परे यदि । श्रमस्तस्य श्रमफलो ह्यधेनुमिव
रक्षतः इति । ततो धीमहीत्यनेन श्रीरामानुजमतं जिज्ञासापदं निदि-
ध्यात्तनपरमेवेति स्वीयत्वेनाङ्गीकरोति श्रीभागवतनामा सर्ववेदादि
साररूपोऽयं ग्रन्थ इत्यायातम् । अथात इत्यस्य व्याख्यामाह—सत्य-
मिति । ०..... ।

तदेवं सम्यक् कर्मकाण्डज्ञानानन्तरं ब्रह्मकाण्डगतं पुंकेषुचि-
द्वाक्येषु स्वर्गाद्यानन्दस्य वस्तुविचारेण दुःस्वरूपत्वव्यभिचारिसत्ताक-
त्वज्ञानपूर्वकं ब्रह्मणस्त्वव्यभिचारिपरतमानन्दत्वेन सत्यत्वज्ञानमेव
ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायां हेतुरिति अथात इत्यस्यार्थं लब्धे तन्निर्गलिनार्थमेवाह
सत्यमिति । सर्वसत्तादाढ्यव्यभिचारिण तावमित्यर्थः । परमित्यनेनान्व-
यात् सत्यं ज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्मेत्यत्र श्रुतौ च ब्रह्मेत्यनेन । तदेवमन्यस्य
तद्विज्ञातृनिर्गलितत्वेन व्यभिचारिसत्ताकत्वमायाति । तदेवमत्र
तदेतदवधि व्यभिचारिसत्ताकमेव ध्यातवन्तो वयमिदानीन्त्यव्यभिचा-
रिसत्ताकं ध्यायेमिति भावः । अथ परत्वमेव व्यनक्ति ध्यायेति । अत्र
धामशब्देन प्रभाव उच्यते प्रकाशो वा गृहदेहान्वितः प्रभावा धामनो-
त्यमगादिनानार्थं वर्गात् न तु स्वरूपम् । तथा कुहकशब्देनात्र प्रताप-
णकदुच्यते । तच्च जीवस्वरूपावरणविक्षेपकारित्वादिना मायावैभव-
मेव । ततश्च स्वेन धाम्ना स्वप्रभावरूपया स्वप्रकाशरूपया वा शक्या
सदा नित्यमेव निरस्ते कुहकं मायावैभवं यस्मात्तम् । एतेन मायातन्
कार्यं विलक्षणं यद् वस्तु तत्तस्य स्वरूपमिति स्वरूपलक्षणमपि गम्यम् ।
तच्च सत्यं ज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्मेति विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्मेति श्रुतिप्रसिद्धमेव ।

..... । तत्र दृष्टान्तेनाप्यमृपान्वं
नाथयति— तेज आदीनां त्रिनिमयः परस्परं शब्दव्यत्ययः इत्यर्थः । स
यथा मृपा न भवति किन्तु यथैवैश्वरान्मर्माणन्तथेत्यर्थः । हन्तेमास्ति-
सो देवतास्त्रिवृदेकैका भवति.....तदन्नस्येति श्रुतं तदेवम्
अर्थस्यास्य श्रुतिमूलत्वान् कल्पनामूलस्त्वन्याऽर्थः स्वत एव परास्तः ।
.....

..... ये तु निर्विशेषवस्तु जिज्ञास्यमिति वदन्ति तन्मते ब्रह्म-
जिज्ञासायां जन्माद्यस्य यत इत्यलङ्कृतं स्यात् । निगतिशयबृहद् बृह-
ण्येति निर्धनान् । तच्च ब्रह्म जगज्जन्मादिकारणमिति वचनाच्च ।

जगज्जन्मादिभ्रमो यतस्तद् ब्रह्मेति स्वात्प्रेक्षपक्षे च न निर्विशेषवस्तु-
सिद्धिः । भ्रममूलमज्ञानमज्ञानसाक्षिब्रह्मेत्युपगमात्..... ।

- तथा सति सविशेषत्वं तदभावे प्रकाशतैव न स्यात् ; किञ्च तेजो
वारिमृदामित्यनेनैव तेषां विवक्षितं से तस्यतीति जन्माद्यस्य यत
इत्यप्रयोजक स्यात्, अनस्तद्विशेषवत्त्वे लब्धे स च विशेषः शक्ति-
रूप एव ; अथ शास्त्रयोनित्वादित्यस्यार्थान्तरं व्याचष्टे, तेन इति ।
तच्चार्थान्तरं यथा—शास्त्रस्य वेदलक्षणस्य योनिः कारणान्तद्रूपत्वात् ।
तदेव विवृत्याह तेन ब्रह्महृदा य आदिकवय इति । ब्रह्म वेदम् आदि-
कवये ब्रह्मणे ब्रह्माणे प्रति हृदान्तःकारणद्वारैव न तु वाक्यद्वारा तेन
आविर्भावितवान् । आदिकवय इत्यनेन तस्यापि शिक्षानिदानत्वाच्छा-
स्त्रयोनित्वञ्चति मुक्तजीवा अपि तत्कारणं नेत्याह मुह्यन्तीति ।
मूरयः शेषादयोऽपि यद् यत् शब्दब्रह्मणि मुह्यन्ति । अनेन च साक्षाद्
भगवन्नेवाभिहितः । स च शब्दादिशक्तिसमुदायस्तस्य न प्राकृतः
प्रकृतित्वाभात् पूर्वचापि सदभावात् । ततः स्वरूपभूत एवम्याह
स्वगाडिति ।

The Agnipurana texts on the meaning of the Gayatri are—

गायत्र्युक्त्यानि शास्त्राणि गर्भं प्राणांस्तथैव च । ततः
P. 37, l. 25. स्मृतंयं गायत्री सावित्री यत ए२ च । प्रकाशिनी सा
सवितुर्चागुरुपत्वात् सगस्वती ॥ तज्ज्योतिः परमं ब्रह्म
भर्गस्तेजो यतःस्मृतः । भर्गः स्याद् भ्राजन इति बहुलं छन्दसीरितम् ॥
वरण्यं सर्वतेजोभ्यः श्रेष्ठं वै परमं परम् । स्वर्गापवर्गकामैर्वा वरणीयं
सदैव हि ॥ वृणोतेर्वरणार्थत्वात् जाग्रत्स्वप्नादिवर्जितम् । नित्यं
शुद्धं बुद्धमेकं नित्यं भर्गमधीश्वरम् ॥ अहं ब्रह्म परं ज्योतिर्ध्यायेम हि
विमुक्तये । तज्ज्योतिर्भगवान् विष्णुर्जगज्जन्मापिकारणम् ॥ अग्न्यादि-
रूपी विष्णुर्हि वेदादौ ब्रह्म गीयते । तत् पदं परमं विष्णोर्देवस्य
सवितुः स्मृतम् दधातेर्वा धीमहीति मनसा धारयेमहि ॥ नोऽस्मा-
कं यच्च भर्गस्तन् सर्वेषां प्राणिनां धियः । चोदयात् प्रेरयाद्बुद्धिं भो-
क्तृणां सर्वकर्मसु ॥ Param. Sandarbha p. 297.

तद्रूपं विष्णुपुराणो श्रीभ्रवेण—ह्लादिनी सन्धिनी सभिवत्तये
का सर्वसंस्थिता । ह्लादतापकरी मिश्रा त्वयि नो गुणवर्जिते ॥ इति ।

तत्र च सति घटानां घटत्वमिव सर्वेषां सतां वस्तूनां प्रतीते निमित्त-
 मिान् क्वचित् सत्तास्वरूपत्वेन आम्नातोऽप्यसौ भगवान्
P. 55, l 19. सदेव सौम्येदमत्र आसीदित्यत्र सद्रूपत्वेन व्यपदिश्य-

मानो यया सत्तां दधाति धारयति च सा सर्वदेशकाल
 द्रव्यादिप्रामिकरी सन्धिनी। तथा सम्विद्रूपोऽपि यया मवेति सम्वेद-
 यति च सा सम्वित्। तथा ह्लादरूपोऽपि यया सम्विदुर्कर्षरूपया त
 ह्लादं सम्वेति सम्वेदयति च सा ह्लादिनीति विवेचनीयम्। *Bhagavat*
Sandarbha p. 191.

शक्तिश्च साविधा अन्नरक्षा वहिरङ्गा तटस्था च। तत्रान्तरङ्गया
 स्वरूपशक्त्याख्यया पूर्णेनैव स्वरूपेण वैकुण्ठादिस्वरूपवैभवरूपेण च
 तदवनिष्ठं, तटस्थया रश्मिस्थानीयचिदेकत्वशुद्धजीव-
P. 65, l 1 रूपेण, वहिरङ्गया मायाख्यया प्रतिच्छविगतवर्णशावल्य-
 स्थानीयवहिरङ्गवैभवजडात्मप्रधानरूपेण च इति चतुर्धा-
 त्वम्। अतएव तदात्मकत्वेन जीवस्यैव तटस्थशक्तिवत्त्वम्, प्रधानस्य
 च मायान्तर्भूतत्वम्। भिन्नेत्य शक्तित्रयं श्रीविष्णुपुराणे गणितम्-विष्णु
 शक्तिः परा प्रोक्ता क्षेत्रज्ञाख्या तथा परा। अविद्या कर्ममज्ञान्या तृतीया
 शक्तिरिष्यते ॥ तथा तिरोहितत्वाच्च शक्तिः क्षेत्रज्ञमंजिता। सर्वभूतेषु
 भूपाल तारतम्येन वर्त्तते ॥ इति। *Bhag. Sandarbha. pp. 65-66.*

स यदजया त्वजामनुशयीत गुणांश्च जुपन् भजति स्वरूपतां
P. 66, l 11. तदनु मृग्युमपतभगः। त्वमुन जहामि तामहिरिव त्वच-
 मात्तभगो महसि महोयसेऽष्टगुणितेऽपरिमेयभगः ॥
Bhāg. X, 87, 33, cited in Bhag. Sandarbha, p. 75.

एकदेशस्थितस्याग्नेज्योन्न्वा विस्तारिणी यथा। परस्य ब्रह्मणः
P. 67, l 12. शक्तिस्तथेदमखिलं जगत् ॥ *V. purāṇa text cited in*
Bhag. Sandarbha, p. 65.

✓ It is to be distinctly noted here that the difference between the rasa of Vaisnava Theology or what is technically called Bhakti-rasa and the other rasas including
P. 61 l 19. the Kāvya-rasa is very great inasmuch as the two kinds of pleasure are absolutely different. In

fact, according to V. Theory, what the science of Poetics describes as Kāvya-rasa cannot come under the category of rasa, the main arguments being that the locus cannot be established. This important topic will be dealt with in detail in the second volume

Such explication of the concept of rasa by way of applying the rules of grammar might appear somewhat far-fetched

to readers. But it is to be noted that this clearly

P. 72. reveals the threefold characteristic of Bhagavān, viz. that He is at once the relishing subject, the object of relish, and the act of relish itself. A similar triune characteristic of God was also conceived by the mystic philosopher Nicolaus of Cusa who holds that God is at once thinking subject, object of thought, and thought (intelligens, intelligibile, intelligere).

As to the meaning of the Gītā text ब्रह्मणो हि प्रतिष्ठाहम् compare the following texts—ब्रह्मणो हि प्रतिष्ठाहमिति । अत्र च

स्वामिपादैर्व्याख्यातम्—ब्रह्मणोऽहं प्रतिष्ठा घनीभूतं ब्रह्म-
P. 84, l 18 वाहम् । यथा घनीभूतप्रकाश एव सूर्यमण्डल तद्वदित्यर्थः । अत्रैव प्रतिष्ठा प्रतिमेति टीका मत्सरकालपता ।

न हि तत्कृता असम्बन्धत्वात् । न हि निराकारस्य ब्रह्मणः प्रतिमा सम्भवति । न चासृत्तस्याव्ययस्येत्याद्यन्तरपादत्रयोक्तानां मोक्षादीनां प्रतिमान्वा घटते । न वा श्रुतशैलीविष्णुपुण्ययोः संवादितास्ति । तस्मान्न सादरणीया यदि वादरणीया तदा तच्छब्देनाप्याश्रय एव वाचनीयः । प्रति लक्ष्मीकृत्य माति परिमितं भवति यत्रेति तदेतत् सर्वमभिप्रेत्याहुः । Bhag Sandarbha, p. 159.

(On this point the texts are—नराकृति परं ब्रह्मेति स्मरणात् पर श्रीकृष्ण धीमहि अस्य स्वरूपलक्षणमाह सत्यमिति । सत्यव्रतं सत्यपर त्रिसत्यमित्यादौ तथा श्रुतत्वात् । एतेन तदाकारस्याव्यभिचारिण्यं दर्शितम् । तटस्थलक्षणमाह—धाम्ना स्थेनेत्यादि । स्थेन

स्वस्वरूपेण धाम्ना श्रीमथुराख्येन सदा निरस्तं कुहकं मायाकार्य-
लक्षणं येन तम् । मथ्यते जगत् सर्वं ब्रह्मज्ञानेन येन वा । तत्सारभूतं

यद् यस्यां मथुरा ल निगद्यते ॥ इति श्रीगोपालोत्तर-

P. 96, l 19. त।पनीप्रसिद्धेः । लीलामाह आद्यस्य नित्यमेव श्रीमदान-

कदुन्दुभिर्ब्रजेश्वरनन्दनतया श्रीमथुराद्वारकगोकुलेषु वि-

राजमानस्य च कस्मैचिदर्थाय लोके प्रादुर्भावापेक्षया । यतः श्रीमदानक-
दुन्दुभिर्गृहाज्जन्म तस्माद् य इतरतश्च इतरत्र श्रीब्रजेश्वरगृहेऽपि अन्व-
यात् पुत्रभावतस्तदनुगतत्वेनागच्छत् उत्तरेणैव य इतिपदेनान्वयः
यत इत्यनेन तस्मादिति स्वयमेव लभ्यते । कथमन्वयात् तत्राह—

अर्थेषु कंसवञ्चनादिषु तादृशभाववद्भाभिः श्रीगोकुलवासिभिरेव सर्वा-
नन्दकदम्बकादम्बिनारूपा सा सा कापि लीला मिथ्यतीति तल्लक्षणेण
वा अर्थेषु अभिज्ञ । ततश्च स्वराद स्वैर्गोकुलवासिभिरेव राजते इति
तत्र तेषां प्रेमवशतामापन्नस्याप्यव्याहृतैश्वर्यमाह—तेन इति । य आ-
दिकवये ब्रह्मणे ब्रह्माणं विस्मापयितुं हृदा सकल्पमात्रेणैव ब्रह्मसत्य-
ज्ञानानन्तानन्दमात्रैकरसमूर्त्तिमयं वेभवं तेन विस्तारितवान् । यद्
यतस्तथाविधलौकिकालौकिकतासमुचितलीलाहेताः सूर्यस्तदुभया
मुह्यन्ति प्रेमानिशयोदयेन वैवश्यमाप्नुवन्ति यदित्युत्तरणाप्यन्वयते ।
यद् यत एव तादृशीलीलातस्तेजोवागिमृदामपि यथा यथावद्विनिमयो
भवति । तत्र तेजसश्चन्द्रादेर्विनिमयो निस्तेजोवस्तुभि सह धर्मपरि-
वर्तः तत्तन्मोखादिरुवा चन्द्रादेर्निस्तेजस्यविधानात् निकटस्थ-
निस्तेजोवस्तुनः स्वभासा तेजस्वितापादानाच्च । तथा वागि
द्रवश्च कठिनं भवति बेणुवाद्येन मृत्पापाणादिः द्रवतीति ।
यतः श्रीकृष्णे त्रिसर्गः श्रीगोकुलमथुराद्वारकावैभव प्रकाशः
अमृषा सत्य एवेति । Śrīkṛṣṇa Sandarbha, pp 344-345.

cf. तत्र चैते चांशकलाः पुल इति परिभाषेति । अवतारवाक्ये-

षु अन्यान् पुरुषांशत्वेन जानीयात् । कृष्णस्तु भगवान्
P. 101, l 19. स्वयमिति प्रतिज्ञाकारणे ग्रन्थार्थनिर्णायकत्वात् । तद्

क्रमम् । अनियमे नियमकारिणी परिभाषेति । अथ परि-
भाषा च सकृदेव पठने शास्त्रे न त्वभ्यासेन । ततश्च वाक्यानां कोटि-

रप्येकैतवामुना शासनीया भवेदिति नास्य गुणवादत्वं प्रत्युनेतद्वि-
रुद्धायमानानां एतदनुगुणार्थनैव वैदुषी । K. Sandarbha, p. 312;
किञ्च शास्त्रं हि शासनात्मकं शासनञ्चोपदेशः । अ च द्विधा साक्षा-
दर्थान्तरद्वारा च । साक्षादुपदेशस्तु श्रुतिरिति परिभाष्यते । साक्षात्व-
ञ्चात्र निरपेक्षत्वमुच्यते । तदुक्तं निरपेक्षरवा 'श्रुतिरिति । तथा च
सति श्रुतिलिङ्गवाक्यप्रकरणस्थानसमाख्यानां समवाये पागर्दावैल्य-
मर्थविप्रकर्षादित्युक्तानुसारेण चरमस्य पूर्वापेक्षाया दृग्प्रतीत्यर्थत्वे
कृष्णस्तु भगवान् स्वयमिति श्रीशौनकं प्रति श्रीःसूतस्य साक्षादुपदे-
शेन इतिहासद्वारापदेशो वाध्येत । K. Sandarbha, p. 314.

कलाभ्यां नितरां हरेरिति हरेः कलापृथ्वी आभ्यां गमकृणा-
भ्यामिति । दिष्ट्याम्ब ते कुक्षिगतः परः पुनानांन साक्षाद्भगवान्
भवाय न इत्यत्र यो मत्स्यादिरूपेणांशेनैव पूर्वं नोऽस्माकं भवायभूत्
हे अम्ब स तु साक्षान् स्वयमेव तव कुक्षिगतोऽस्तीति । ततो जग-
न्मङ्गलमच्युतांशमिति तु सप्तम्यन्यपदार्थो बहुव्रीहिः । तस्मिन्नांशेनि
अवतगति नेपामंशानामप्यत्र प्रवेशस्य व्याख्यास्यमानत्वात् एवमेव
“ताविमौ वै भगवतो हंरंशाविहागतौ । भारव्ययाय च भुवः कृष्णौ
यदु कुरुद्वहौ ॥” इत्यत्र आगताविति कर्त्तरि निष्ठा कृष्णाविति
कर्मणि द्वितीया । ततश्च भगवतो नानावतारवर्जस्य हरेः पुरुषस्य
ताविमौ नारायणाख्यौ अंशौ कर्त्तृभूतौ कृष्णौ कृष्णार्जुनौ कर्मभूता-
वागतवन्तौ तयोः प्रविष्टवन्तावित्यर्थः । नारायणसमो गुणैरित्यत्रापि
नारायणः परच्योमाधिप एव गुणैः समो यस्येत्येव गर्गाभिप्रायः ।
“द्विजात्मजा मे युवयोर्दिदक्षुणा मयोपनीता भुवि धर्मगुप्तये ।
कलावतीर्णावनेर्भरासुरान् हन्वह भूयस्त्वरयेतमन्तिमे ॥” इत्यस्य
युवयोर्युवां दिदक्षुणा मया द्विजपुत्रा मे मम भुवि धाम्नि उपनीता
अनीता इत्येकं वाक्यं, वाक्यान्तरमाह हे धर्मगुप्तये कलावतीर्णौ क-
ला अंशास्तदयुक्ताववतीर्णौ मध्यमपदलोपी समासः, कलायामंशलक्षणे
मायिकप्रपञ्चेऽवतीर्णौ वा, पादोऽस्य विश्वा भूतानीति श्रुतेः, भूयः
पुनरपि अवशिष्टानवनेर्भरासुरान् हत्वा मेमम अग्नि समीपाय समी-
पमागमयितुं युवां त्वरयेतं त्वरयतम् अत्र प्रस्थाप्य तान् मोचयत-

मित्यर्थः, तद्वतानां मुक्तिप्रसिद्धेः महाकातज्योतिरेव मुक्ताः प्रविशन्ती-
ति । K. Sandarbha, pp. 313-316.

श्रीकृष्णलीला द्विविधा, अप्रकटरूपा प्रकटरूपा च । प्रापञ्चिक-
लोकाप्रकटत्वात् नन्प्रकटत्वाच्च । तत्राप्रकटा, “यत्रानो संस्थितः
कृष्णस्त्रिभिः शक्त्या समाहिताः । रामानिरुद्ध प्रद्युम्ने
P. 129, last रुक्मिण्या सहितो विश्वे” इति त्र्युगातत्त्वप्रतिपादक-
line. and P श्रीगोपालतापन्यादा, “चेत्तानां प्रकटमन्त्रानुकरपवृत्ते-

154, 1-3. न्यादिगुन्दावनतत्त्वप्रतिपादकग्रह. माहितादां च, प्रकट-

लीलानः किञ्चिद् विलज्ज पन्थेन गच्छा. प्रापञ्चिकलोकै-
स्तद्वस्तुमिश्रान्तिरा. कालवदादिनाध्यायनपरिच्छेदग्रहितस्व-
प्रवाहा. याद्वेन्द्रस्वप्रजयुवराजत्वाद्भूविवाह इतिहान्तमोक्षेशमा-
चारणयिनेदितिलक्षणा । प्रकटरूपा तु श्रीविष्णुवत् कालादिभिर-
परिच्छेद्यैव नती भगवदिच्छात्मकस्वरूपशक्त्यैव लब्ध्यागम्यमापना
प्रापञ्चिकाप्रापञ्चिकलोकवस्तुसंबलिता तदीयजन्मादिलक्षणा ।

K. Sandarbha, pp. 404-405.

तत्राप्रकटा द्विविधा, मन्त्रोपासनामयी स्वारसिकी च । प्रथमा
यथा, तत्तदेकतरस्थानादिनियतस्थितिका तत्तन्मन्त्रध्यानमयी । या
तु तत्तत्काप्रतात्मकप्रयोगमयी । पूतनावधादिरूपा
P. 155, 1-4. अद्यापि साधकहृदि कदाचिन् साम्प्रतीव स्फुरति सा
खलु मन्त्रोपासनामयीन्वेऽपि स्वारसिकयामेव पश्यन्-
स्यति । K. Sandarbha, pp. 405-406.

On Jiva cf — श्रीजामातृमुनिनाम्नुपदिष्टं यथा—आत्मा न
देहो न नरा न निर्धक स्यान्नरो न च । न देहो नेन्द्रियं नैव मनः
प्राणो न नापि धीः । न जडो न विकारी न ज्ञानमात्रा-
P. 158, head लमको न च स्वस्मै स्वयं प्रकाशः etc. This agrees
line. with the Padmapurāṇa view as Jiva Goswāmī
says —अथ परमात्मपरिकरेषु जीवस्तस्य च तटस्थ-
लक्षणं क्षेत्रज्ञ गता इत्यत्रोक्तं स्वरूपलक्षणं पाद्माक्षरस्मरणादिकमनु-
मन्य श्रीरामानुजाचार्यादिति प्राचीनेन श्री वैष्णवसम्प्रदायगुरुणा
श्रीजामातृमुनिनोपदिष्टम् । Param. Sandarbha, p. 224.

On classifications of Jivas cf.—तदेवमनन्ता एव जीवाख्या-
स्तदस्थशक्तयः । तत्र तासां वर्गद्वयम् । एको वर्गोऽनादिन एव भग-
वदुन्मुखः अन्यस्त्वनादिन एव भगवत्पराङ्मुखः । स्व-
P. 166, l25. भावनस्तदीयज्ञानभावात्तदीयज्ञानाभावाच्च । तत्र प्रथमो-
ऽन्तरङ्गाशक्तिविलासानुगृहीतो नित्यभगवत्परिकररूपो
गरुडादिकः । अस्य च तदस्थत्वं जीवत्वप्रसिद्धेश्वरत्वकोटावप्रवे-
शात् । अपरस्तु तत्पराङ्मुखत्वदोषेण लब्धच्छिद्यया मायया परि-
भूतः संसारी । Param. Sandarbha, p. 239.

On the doctrine of Mayā cf.—माया स्यादन्तरङ्गायां वहि-
रङ्गा च सा स्मृता । प्रधानेऽपि कचिददृष्टा तद्वृत्तिर्मोहिनी च सा ॥
आद्ये त्रये स्यात् प्रकृतिश्चिच्छक्तिस्वन्नराङ्गिका । शुद्ध-
P. 167, head जीवेऽपि ते दृष्टे तथेशज्ञानवीर्ययोः ॥ चिन्मायाशक्ति-
line. वृत्त्योस्तु विद्याशक्तिरुदीर्यते । चिच्छक्तिवृत्तौ मायायां
योगमाया समा स्मृता ॥ प्रधानाव्याकृताव्यक्तं त्रैगुण्ये
प्रकृतौ परम् । न मायायां न चिच्छक्तावित्याद्यूहं विवेकिभिरिति ॥
Param. Sandarbha, p. 245.

cf. कार्यान्तरेणपि तीर्थे भ्रमनो महतां प्रायस्तत्र भ्रमतां
तिष्ठतां वा दर्शनस्पर्शनसम्भावनादिलक्षणा सेवा
P. 272. स्वत एव सम्पद्यते : तत्प्रभावेण तदीयाचरणे
श्रद्धा भवति ; तदीयस्वाभाविकपरस्परभगवत्-
कथायां किमेते संकथयन्ति तत् शृणोमीति तदिच्छा जायते : तच्छ्र-
वणेन च तस्यां रुचिर्जायते इति । Bhakti Sandarbha, p. 455.

cf. परोक्षवादो वेदोऽयं बालानामनुशासनम् । कर्ममोक्षाय
कर्मणि विधत्ते ह्यगदं यथा ॥ नाद्यरेद् यस्तु वेदोक्तं स्वयमङ्गोऽजि-
तेन्द्रियः । विकर्मणा ह्यधर्मेण मृत्योर्मृत्युमुपैति सः ॥
P. 275. वेदोक्तमेव कुर्वाणो निःसङ्गोऽर्पितमीश्वरे । नैकर्म्यां
लभते सिद्धिं रोचनार्थां फलश्रुतिः ॥ य आशु हृदयप्र-
न्थि निर्जिह्वीर्षुः परात्मनः । विधिना च यजेद्देवं तन्त्रोक्तेन च केशवम् ॥
Bhāg. texts cited in Bh. Sandarbha, p. 473.

cf. ब्रह्मज्ञानं द्विविधानां जायते । तत्र भगवदुपासकानामानुष-
ङ्गिकत्वेन ब्रह्मोपासकानां स्वतन्त्रत्वेन । भगवदुपासकैस्तु भगवच्छ-
क्तिरूपया भक्त्या किञ्चिद्भेदेनैव गृह्यते । तच्च ब्रह्मभूतः
P. 279. प्रसन्नात्मा न शोचति न काञ्चति इत्यादि श्रीगीतोक्त्यनु-
सारेण, आत्मारामाश्च मुनय इत्याद्यनुसारेण च भगवतः
पराख्यभक्तिपरिकरो भवति इति । ब्रह्मोपासकैस्तु पूर्ववद्भेदेनैव गृह्यते ।
Bh. Sandarbha, pp. 519-520.

On this point the texts are— विप्रादिद्विपद्गुणयुतादरविन्द-
नाभपादारविन्दविमुखात् श्वपचं वरिष्ठम् । मन्ये तदर्पितमनोवचने-
द्वितार्थे प्राणं पुनाति सकुलं न तु भूरिमान इति । टीका
P. 288. च भक्त्यैव केवलया हरेस्तोषः संभवतीत्युक्तम् । इदानीं
भक्तिं विना नान्यत् किञ्चित्तोषहेतुरित्याह विप्रादिति ।
मन्ये धनाभिजनरूपतपःश्रुतौजस्तेजःप्रभावबलपौरुषबुद्धियोगा
इत्यादौ पूर्वोक्ता ये धनादयो द्विपद् द्वादश गुणास्तेर्युक्ताद्विप्रादपि
श्वपचं वरिष्ठं मन्ये । यद्वा सनत्सुजातोक्ता द्वादश धर्मादयो गुणा
द्रष्टव्याः—धर्मश्च सत्यश्च दमस्तपश्च अमानसस्यं ह्रींस्तिनिज्ञान-
सूया । यज्ञश्च दानञ्च धृतिः श्रुतञ्च व्रतानि चैव द्वादश ब्राह्मणस्य ॥
इति मुक्ताफलटीका च—द्विपद् द्वादश गुणाः धनाभिजनादयः । यद्वा
शमो दमस्तपः शौचं चान्नयार्जवविरक्तयः । ज्ञानविज्ञानसन्तोषाः
सत्यास्तिक्यं द्विपद् गुणाः ॥ इत्यत्रोक्ता इत्येवा । Bh. Sandarbha,
p. 490.

cf. स चात्मसाक्षान्कारो द्विविधः, अन्तराविर्भावलक्षणो वहि-
P. 333. राविर्भावलक्षणश्च । Pr. Sandarbha, p. 684.

प्रीतिशब्देन खलु मुत्प्रमदहर्षानन्दादिपर्ययां सुखमुच्यते ।
भावहार्दसौहृदादिपर्याया प्रियता चोच्यते । तत्र उल्लासात्माको ज्ञान-
विशेषः सुखम् । तथा विषयानुकूल्यात्मकस्तदानुकूल्यानुगततत्स्पृ-
हानदनुभवहेतुकोल्लासमयज्ञानविशेषः प्रियता । अत एवास्यां सुख-
त्वेऽपि पूर्वतो वैशिष्ट्यम् । तयोः प्रतियोगिनौ च क्रमेण दुःखद्वेयौ ।
अतः सुखस्य उल्लासमातात्मकत्वादाश्रय एव विद्यते न तु विषयः ।

एवं तत्प्रतियोगिनो दुःखस्य च । प्रियतायास्त्वानुकूल्यस्पृहात्मक-
त्वाद् विषयश्च विद्यते । एवं प्रातिकूल्यात्मकस्य तत्-
P. 343. प्रतियोगिनो द्वेषस्य च । तत्र सुखदुःखयोराश्रयौ
सुष्ठुदुष्टदुर्कर्माणौ जीवौ । प्रियताद्वेषयोराश्रयौ प्रीय-
माणद्विषन्तौ । विषयौ च तत्प्रियद्वेष्यौ । Pr. Sandarbha, p. 718.

cf. निखिलपरमानन्द चन्द्रिकाचन्द्रमसि सकलभुवनसौभाग्य-
सारसर्वस्वसत्त्वगुणोपजीव्यानन्तविलासमयामायिकविशुद्धसत्त्वानव-
रतोल्लासादसमोर्द्धमधुरे श्रीभगवाते कथमपि चितावतारादन-
पेक्षितविधिः स्वरसत एव समुल्लसन्ती विषयान्तरैरन-

P. 344. वच्छेद्या तात्पर्यान्तरमसहमाना ह्लादिनीसारवृत्तिवि-
शेषस्वरूपा भगवदानुकूल्यात्मकतदनुगततत्स्पृहादि-
मयज्ञानविशेषाकारा तादृशभक्तमनोवृत्तिविशेषदेहा पीयूषपूरतोऽपि
सरसेन स्वेनैव स्वदेहं सरसयन्ती भक्कृतात्मरहस्यसङ्गोपनगुणमय-
रसनावाष्पमुक्तादिव्यक्लपक्वकारा सर्वगुणैकनिधानस्वभावा दासी-
कृतशेषपुरुषार्थसम्पत्तिका भगवत्पातिव्रत्यवच्यवचर्यापय्याकुला
भगवन्मनोहरणैकोपायहारिरूपा भागवती प्रीतिस्तमुपसेवमाना
विराजत इति । Pr. Sandarbha, pp. 730-731.

cf. प्रीतिः खलु भक्ताचित्तमुल्लासयति, ममतया योजयति विस्त्र-
P. 345 ङ्भयति, प्रियत्वातिशयेनाभिमानयति, द्रावयति, स्व-
विषयं प्रत्याभिलाषातिशयेन योजयति, प्रतिलक्षणमेव स्व-
विषयं नवनवत्वेनानुभावयति, असमोर्द्धचमत्कारेणोन्मादायति च ।
Pr. Sandarbha, p. 733.

**LIST OF AUTHORITIES CONSULTED
AND CITED.**

- Advaitabrahmasiद्धि (Bombay Edition)
 Atharvanopanishad.
 Ādipurāṇa.
 Antitheistic Theories (Robert Flint).
 Bangabhāṣa O Sāhitya (Dr. Dīnēśachandra Sen).
 Bhagavad gītā (Bombay and Bengal Editions)
 Bhāgavata (Bombay and Bengal Editions)
 Bhaktichandrikā (Narahari Saṅkārā Thākura).
 ✓ Bhakti Cult in Ancient India (Dr. Bāgavata Kumāra Śāstri)
 . Bhaktirasūnīśālini (Rūpa Goswāmī).
 Bhaviṣya purāṇa (Calcutta Edition).
 Bible.
 Brahmaṇḍapurāṇa.
 Brahma-saṃhitā (Berhampore Edition).
 ✓ Chaitanyachandrodaya (Kavi Karmapura).
 ✓ Chanḍidāsa
 Charakasamhitā (Edited with Chakradatta's commentaries
 by Harinātha Viśārada).
 Concordance to the Principal Upanishads and Bhagavad
 Gītā, A, (Jacob).
 Formal Logic (Keynes).
 Garuḍa purāṇa.
 Gītāya Īśwaravāda (Hirendra Nath Datta).
 Gopāla-Champū (Jiva Goswāmī).
 Gopālātāpani Śruti (Berhampore edition).
 History of Ethics (Mackenzie).
 „ „ Philosophy (Ueberweg).
 „ „ „ (Erdmann).
 „ „ Indian Philosophy (Radha Kṛṣṇan)

II

- History of Indian Philosophy (S. Dasgupta).
" " Sanskrit Literature (Macdonall)
Hegel (Caird)—Blackwood Series
Hegel's Logic (Wallace).
Kāvya-prakāśa (Mammata)
Kingdom of God is within you, The, (Tolstoi).
Kṛṣṇa Karmāmṛta (Bilvamangala Thākura).
Laghuhbhāgavatāmṛta (Rūpa Goswāmī).
Mahābhārata (Bengal Edition).
Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad.
Mānu Saṃhitā (Bombay Edition)
Methods of Ethics (Sidgwick).
Mīmāṃsādarśana (Jaimini)
Modern Philosophy (Hoffling).
Muktāphala (Edited by the Calcutta Oriental Company)
Nyāyatātparyyaṭikā (Vāchaspatimisra).
Original Sanskrit Texts (Muir).
Outlines of Greek Philosophy (Zeller).
Padmapurāṇa (Bengal Edition).
✓ Pañchurātra (Narada).
Philosophy of Religion, An Introduction to the, (Caird).
Prameyasaratnāvalī (Vidyābhūṣaṇa)
✓ Premabhakti chandrikā (Narottama Thākura).
Prolegomena to Ethics (Green).
Rg Veda (Maxmuller's Edition).
Satapathabrāhmaṇa (Asiatic Society of Bengal).
Saṃkṣepa Śārīraka.
✓ Sarvadarśana Saṃgraha (Mādhavāchāryya, translated by
Cowell and Gough).
Sāṃkhya Kārikā (ĪśvaraKṛṣṇa).
Sāṃkhyapravachana Bhāṣya (Vijñāna Bhikṣu).
Sanskrit Poetics (S. K. De).
Siddhāntamuktāvalī.

III

Siddhantaratna (Vidyābhāṣaṇa).

Śivapurāṇa.

Speeches and Writings (M. K. Gandhi)

Suśruta Samhitā (Calcutta Edition).

Tattwaprakāśikā (on Mādhyabhāṣya)

Upanisads, The Twenty-eight, (Bombay Edition.)

Ujjvalanīlamani (Rūpa Goswāmī)

Vaṅṇapurāṇa.

Vedantaparibhāṣa (Bombay Edition)

Vedānta Philosophy (Dr. Priyanath Sen).

Vedānta Sāra (Jacobs Edition).

✓ Vedānta Sūtra with Śaṅkara's Commentary.

„ „ Rāmānuja's „

„ „ Madhwāchāryya's „

„ „ Vidyābhāṣaṇa's „

„ Translated by Thibaut—Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja.

Vidagdhamādhava (Rūpa Goswāmī).

Vidyāpati (Grierson).

Viṣṇupurāṇa (Wilson's Edition).

Yogabhāṣya Vārtika (Vāchaspati miśra).

Yoga Sūtra (Patañjali)



INDEX.

The figures denote pages, and references to foot-
notes are marked with an asterisk.

A	
Abhāva, as a source of know- ledge,	1.
Abhidheya, 11 int.,	45.
Absolute, problem of,	45-47.
Absolute Being, faith in, 1 int;	17;
„ as related to individual soul, 1 int; 182-209;	
„ as the object of Vaiṣṇa- vism 11 int;	
„ as the source of the Vedas, Itihāsa and Purāṇas, 12, 13, 30-33, 37, 38, 45;	
„ characteristics of the name of,	15;
„ realisation open to all, 15, 25, 34, 35;	
„ as direct revealer of the Bhāgavata,	23;
„ as both Transcendent and Immanent, 24, 29, 30;	
„ as the foremost chief, Satya (true), Sachchi- dānandavigraha,	26-28, 34;
„ as capable of conquer- ing Māyā,	27;
„ as the source of crea- tion etc., 27-32, 34-38;	
„ as defined in two ways, 28-30;	
„ as having form and body,	30;
„ as consisting of supreme bliss,	35, 85*;
„ as self-luminous and illuminator of all,	38;
„ as revealed to Vyāsa,	40;
„ as adhokṣaja,	46.
„ as a Substance having attributes,	50-54;
„ having no Swagata bheda, 51, 52, 109, 110;	
„ having potencies, 54- 59, 64-75, 110, 112 135-140, 159, 160;	
„ as Rasa,	57, 69-74;
„ having a peculiar dress, dwelling place, deco- ration etc, 75, 76; 113- 121;	
„ having the form and body similar to those of a human being, 62- 64, 113-114;	
„ as that in whom all contradictions are re-	

- conciled, 64, 76-78, 112,
113, 133, 156;
- „ as Nirviśeṣa Brahman,
81, 82, 124, 198.
- „ as realised differently
82, 83;
- „ as the Substratum of
Brahman,—the non-di-
fferenced Substance,
84-86;
- „ as the Immanent Regu-
lator of all beings, 87
93;
- „ as Pūrṇa and Pūrṇa-
tama, 134;
- „ not as an Abstract
Idea, 147;
- „ as Perfect, 248.
- Accumulated, 9 int.;
- Achintya-bhedābheda, as rela-
tion between the Abso-
lute and Māyā, 27;
- „ as relation between
Substance and attri-
bute in the Absolute,
71;
- „ as theory of the Vedā-
nta, 73, 119;
- „ as relation between the
three concepts of Bha-
gavān, Brahman and
Paramātmā, 92;
- „ as relation between
Kṛṣṇa and His dwell-
ing place and associa-
tes, 120, 121, 138, 139;
- „ as relation between the
Vaiṣṇava theory and
the various theories
of monism, dualism or
pluralism, 130;
- „ as relation between
Mabābhāva and the
other kinds of divine
emotional love, 145;
- „ as relation between
God and Soul, 182, 183,
187, 189;
- „ as relation between the
Vaiṣṇava theory and
the other religious the-
ories current, 259;
- „ as relation between the
Kṛṣṇa cult and the Gon-
rāṅga cult, 190.
- „ as relation between
Bhagavān and Bhakti
268;
- „ as relation between Jiva
and Paramātmā, 285;
- „ as relation between
Bhakti and Mukti, 340,
341
- Achintya Śakti 27, 64, 67, 68,
„ as operating in the re-
conciliation of contradic-
tory elements, 121, 154,
157;
- „ as operating in the case
of the difference between
the permanent nature of
the Absolute and the im-
permanence of the world
211;

- „ as barring the possibility
of an illusory world,
219.
- Adhokṣaja, 46;
- Adhvaryu, 13;
- Adhyāhāra, a process of inter-
pretation adopted by Śaṅkara,
42, 186, 200
- Adhyāropa, the doctrine of,
as the basis of Śaṅkar's the-
ory of Māyā, 179;
- Adiṣṭa, 8 int., 65;
- Advaya-jñāna-tattwa, 48-59;
- „ as identical with Bhaga-
vān, 59, 60, 63;
- „ as the substratum of
Brahman as established
by Śaṅkara, 86;
- „ as underlying the three
concepts of Bhagavān,
Brahman and Paramā-
tmā 92;
- „ Kṛṣṇa as the, 100, 108.
- „ its full import, 148;
- „ Gourāṅga as 235-255.
- Affection, as a meaning of Prīti
343;
- „ as a stage in the heirarc-
hy of super-springs of
action, 344;
- „ as an underlying princi-
ple in some moral duties,
357.
- Aham, as a characteristic of
- Jīva, 160, 161;
- „ its explanation, 163, 164.
- Ahaitukī, a characteristic of
Bhakti, 265;
- „ becoming Prema Bhakti,
255-267:
- „ as relating to Kṛṣṇa al-
one, 273;
- „ as characterising the Di-
vinities of Bhagavān's
Swarūpa śaktis, 310;
- „ as characterising the
sevā, or servitude to
Bhagavān, 340,
- Aitihya, a source of knowle-
dge 2.
- Aja, as implied by the Praṇ-
ava, 37;
- „ as qualifying Paramātmā
87;
- „ a characteristic of Jīva
as occuring in the Kāth.
Up., 166;
- „ as qualifying both Para-
mātmā and Jivātmā, 181
- Ajñā, as meaning Māyā, 160,
181.
- Akiñchanā, see ahaitukī.
- Akṣapāda, 10.
- Aksara, qualifying Hara which
means Jīva, 182
- All-pervading, as the true
meaning of Viṣṇu, 4 int;
- „ as an attribute of Para-

- mātmā or Vāsudeva, 89; Asamprajñāta Samādhi, a stage in yoga, 183.
- „ as qualifying the supreme region of Kṛṣṇa, 121; Asat, its meaning in the text 'asadeva etc', 123;
- „ as qualifying Jiva, 162. „ as characterising Māyā, 172, 174, 175;
- 163, 163* „ as qualifying 'world', 212-215.
- Analytic, 205-207.
- Anarthanivṛtti, 271, 272.
- Aniruddha, one of the vyūhas of Kṛṣṇa, 218.
- Anumāna, see Inference and Syllogism.
- Anupalabdhī, see Abhāva.
- Anuvandha, 45.
- Anuvāda, 59*.
- Apara śakti, 65.
- Apologetic, of Hinduism, 101-108;
- Aprakāṣa līlā, 153-157, 250.
- Aprārābhida, a class of acts, 292.
- Apūrva, as the summum bonum according to the Mīmāṃsā system, 329.
- Archana, an element in Injunctory Bhakti, 307, 308.
- Aristotle, on causality, 168;
- „ on summum bonum, 323, 324.
- Arthavāda, a class of Vedic texts, 211, 212.
- Arthāpatti, as a pramāṇa, 1, 2.
- Arjuna, as appearing in the Gītā 124-128;
- „ as standing to Kṛṣṇa in a friendly relation, 142.
- Atharvan, 11.
- Avachcheda-vāla, a theory on the relation between Brahman and soul, 192-195.
- Avatāra, the view about Kṛṣṇa being an, 243;
- „ defined, 245;
- „ classification of avatāras, 243;
- „ the philosophic necessity etc. about, 245, 246.
- Avatāri, Kṛṣṇa as, 236, 237;
- „ the philosophic necessity etc. about, 242-250.
- Avidyā śakti, as having two fold function, 136, 137, 138*;
- „ as a function of Jiva Māyā. 170, 171, 192.
- Avyakta, see Pradhāna.
- Avyākṛta, see Pradhāna.
- Ābhira, 288.
- Ādhibhōvika, a class of miseries, 249.
- Ādhidaivika-a class of miseries, 249.
- Ādhyātmika, a class of miseries, 249.
- Ādikavi, as occurring in the

- first verse of the Bhāgavata, 23, 32, 38.
- Ākāśa, its meaning in the text 'Kohyevāṇyāt etc' 8, 74 74*
- Ākhyāna, as a portion of the Vedas, 13.
- Ānandaghana, as qualifying Brahman, 69.
- Ārsa, as a kind of pramāṇa, 1.
- Archimedes, 222, 223.
- Āsakti, as a stage in Bhakti, 271.
- Āsraya, Brahman as, of the connection with Māyā 192, 193; „ Kṛṣṇa as, 247, 249.
- „ Gaurāṅga as, 255, 257.
- Ātmanikṣepa, as constituting śaranāpatti, 303, 304.
- Ātmanivedana, an element in Injunctory Bhakti, 309.
- Ātma, as applying to Jīva, 160, 162, 165; „ as an element in the generic concept of Māyā, 170.
- Āvaranātunkā, a function of Avidyā, 136, 170, 175.
- Āvidyā, as an import of Avidyā, 136*.
- Āula, a so called sect of Vaiṣṇavas, 6 int.
- B
- Bain, on summum bonum, 325.
- Benevolence, as a moral quality, 355, 356.
- Bentham, on the external duty of kindness, 354.
- Berkeley, on subjective idealism, 218.
- Bhaga, its meaning, 61.
- Bhagavān, as the most primeval being, 9; „ its primary meaning, 24; „ elaboration of the concept of, 59-80; „ as having a human form, 62-64; „ His dwelling place etc., 75, 76; „ as distinguished from Brahman, 82, 83; „ as the substratum of Brahman, 84-86.
- Bhajanakriyā, one of the nine stages of Bhakti, 271.
- Bhakti, as defined in the Mātara śruti, 40, 41, „ as counteracting the influence of Māyā 261, 269, 270; „ as the true means for attainment of the knowledge of Bhagavān, 262, 263; „ as the highest dharma, 264, 265; 314, 315; „ as alaituki or akiñchanā and apratihatā, 265-268, 273;

- „ standing to Bhagavān in
bhedābheda relation, 268;
- „ as implying the combi-
nation of bliss, knowle-
dge and act, 268-270;
- „ nine stages of, 271-273;
- „ Jīva's proneness to, 293,
296;
- „ two stages of, 302-321;
- „ as fivefold, 310-313;
- „ as an act, 329.
- Bhakti-mārga, its superiority
over the Karma-mārga,
277, 278;
- „ superiority over the Jñā-
na-mārga, 280-282;
- „ as related to the Karma,
Jñāna and Yoga Mār-
ga, 284-287;
- „ excellences of, 287-293.
- Bhāgavata, on the authorita-
tiveness of the Vedas, 11;
- „ its supreme authorita-
tiveness, 20-39;
- „ defined, 22, 23
- „ as revealed to Vyāsa in
his spiritual meditation,
22, 39;
- „ as the unfolders of the
true meaning of the
Brahman Sūtras and of
the Gāyatrī, 23-39;
- „ its importance, populari-
ty and contents, 39-45;
- „ as accepted by Śaṅkara,
41-43;
- „ as the very representa-
tive of Kṛṣṇa, 44;
- „ the first verse of, as in-
volving the concept of
Kṛṣṇa, 96-98;
- „ on the reality of the
world, 219;
- „ on the blissful potency
of Kṛṣṇa, 237;
- „ on the concept of Gon-
rāṅga, 251-253;
- „ on religious merit as ba-
sed upon injunctions,
314, 315.
- Bhāṣya, the true function of,
20*.
- Bhāva, as one of the nine sta-
ges of Bhakti, 271;
- „ as a synonym for Prīti,
343.
- Bondage, cause of, 8-9 int;
- Bonum, see Summum bonum.
- Brahman, the primary mean-
ing of, 23, 24;
- „ as the ultimate Reality,
24;
- „ knowledge of 24, 25;
- „ the swarūpa lakṣaṇa and
tatastha lakṣaṇa of, 28-
33; 96-97;
- „ as an embodied substra-
tum possesssing qualities, 49-
52, 60;

- „ the concept of, explained, 80-87, 172-179;
 „ as Nirviśeṣa and Saviśeṣa, 198.
Brahmabhāva, the true meaning of, 330, 331.
Brahmadāna, 357.
Brahmajijñāsā, 332.
Brahmanaya, as a class of followers of the Jñāna mārṅa, 279.
Brahmasampatti, see **Brahmabhāva**.
Brahma sūtra, on the authoritativeness of the Vedas, 10-11. See also **Vedānta**.
Brahma-vedana, as identical with **Brahmabhāva**, 330.
Brahmā, as an agency in the performance of sacrifices, 13;
 „ as **Hiranyagarbha** the **Ādi Kavi**, 32 33: 38,
 „ as the direct causality in creation, 37; 121;
 „ the delusion of; as stated in the **Bhāgavata**, 98;
 „ as a great devotee to **Kṛṣṇa**, 149.
Brahmāṇḍa, as manifest in the **Brahma-mohana līlā** of **Kṛṣṇa**, 121.
 „ as the place for **Kṛṣṇa's** manifest sports, 118.
Brahmāpyaya, see **Brahma Vedana**.
Brāhminism, the blind bigotry of, 187.
Buddha, 10.
Buddhism, as admitting two **pramāṇas**, 1;
 „ **Śaṅkara's** theory as the semblance of, 42;
 „ referred to in the **Gītā**, 180*.
 „ on **summum bonum**, 328.
Caird, as a writer on philosophy of religion, 4 int;
 „ on **Vedānta**, 5 int;
 „ as an interpreter of **Hegel**, 21;
 „ on the authoritative-ness of revelation, 40,
 „ as criticising **Spinoza**, 223.
Chaitanya, see **Gonrāṅga**;
 „ meaning **Jīva**, when appropriated to the internal organ, 192.
Chandāla, as welcome to the **Bhāgavata Cult**, 287, 288, 292.
Charaka, on **sensuous rasa**, 69-70, 311;
 „ as defining substance and attribute, 70;
 „ on human personality, 137*;

- „ on ātmajñāna as the real happiness. 350*
- Charity, as a moral quality, 355, 356.
- Chārvāka, as admitting only one pramāṇa, 1, 5;
- „ as a materialistic philosophy, 217;
- „ on summum bonum, 327, 328-
- Cheṣṭā, as a source of knowledge, 2.
- Chit, finite and infinite, 48;
- „ as constituting the Absolute, 49-50;
- „ as the meaning of Jñāna, 52-53;
- „ as implying the three Swarūpa Śaktis combined, 69*, 167;
- „ the divine associates of Kṛṣṇa as consisting of pure, 118;
- „ as concentrated in Nanda and Yaśodā, 119;
- „ the dwelling place proper of Kṛṣṇa as consisting of pure, 120;
- „ pure, as the synonym for Viśuddha sattwa, 138*;
- „ involved in bliss, 141
- „ as constituting Jīva, 160;
- „ pure as one of the six beginningless entities, 161*;
- „ meaning Jīva, when appropriated to the internal organ, 192;
- „ impartite, as both the subject and object of Ignorance, 192-193;
- „ the reflection of in intellects, 196;
- „ the essence of, as constituting Bhakti, 200-201.
- Christ the personality of, 223-234;
- „ the life of, as illustrating the maxim of mischief returned by good, 242.
- Christianity, eulogised by Caird 4 int
- „ as implicitly accepting the theory about the human form of the Absolute, 62-63;
- „ the intrinsic nature of, 234;
- „ on summum bonum, 325.
- Comparison as a kind of pramāṇa, 1-2.
- Comte, on servitude to Humanity, 364, 365.
- Conduct, defined,
- Conjugal love, the meaning of,

- in V. Theology, 144-145,
146*, 319-321.
- Conscience, as playing a part
in Dharma. 264, 302.
- Co-ordination, the principle
of, 202-204.
- Creation, see World.
- Current, a class of acts, 9 int.
- Daiva, the meaning of, 163-
169.
- Darkness, as a constituent ele-
ment of Pradhāna or
Prakṛti, 35.
- Dāśya, as a stage in the perso-
nal relationship be-
tween God and His de-
votee. 143, 308, 308*,
312, 313.
- Deha, the meaning of, 170.
- Descartes, on the relation be-
tween religion and mo-
rality, 347.
- Determinism, the Hindu theory
of, 348.
- Devakī, the metaphysical
meaning of, 118;
„ as the acknowledge mo-
ther of Kṛṣṇa, 119-120;
„ the Lord Madhusūdana
as the son of, 34.
- Devotion, see Bhakti.
- Dharma, as defined by Manu,
3*;
„ as implying various
kinds of duty, 125,
„ the highest conception
of,
„ as Pravṛttilakṣaṇa, and
Nivṛttilakṣaṇa, 268, 269,
„ as defined by Jaimini,
314.
- Dhāraṇā as an element in In-
junctory Bhakti, 306
- Dhruvānusmṛti, as an element
in Injunctory Bhakti,
306, 306*.
- Dhyāna, as a synonym for
knowledge', 24-25;
„ as an element in Bhakti
306;
„ as defined by Ramanuja
and Patañjali, 306*.
- Dialectic, Hegelian, 21.
- Divinity, of the threefold
Swarūpa Śaktis of Kṛṣ-
ṇa, 138-139;
„ gradation between the
divinities of the Swarū-
pa Śaktis, 139-145;
„ of the bliss attribute of
Bhagavān, 310-313;
„ of Christ, 233-234.
- Dogma, dogmas common to
the six systems of In-
dian Philosophy, 7 int.
- Dravya, the meaning of, 168-
169.

Dualism, in the V. System.

139.

Duty, Dharma as a kind of,

264;

„ the highest conception

of, 264, 265;

„ the categorical imperative of,

265;

„ the nature of, towards the spiritual guide, 300.

„ classified on the basis of the nature of life-conception,

351, 352;

„ moral duties in their bearing upon the V System,

352-374.

Dvaitādvaita-Vāda, See Achintya bhedābheda.

Dwārakā as the place for Kṛṣṇa's beatific sports, 111-

112, 154.

E

Efficient cause, see Aristotle.

Ego, Jīva as,

163, 164:

„ real and empirical, 163-165; 170.

Egoism, ethical theories of,

325.

Emancipation, the doctrine of, as common to the six systems of Indian Philosophy, 10 int.; see also Mukti

Emotion, as appearing in the

divine love between Kṛṣṇa and the divinities of

His bliss potency, 137,

141-146, 146*, 247, 248, 255-257,

„ as appearing amongst irrational animals and plants,

236-240:

„ the physiological changes of,

266;

„ as conjugal love, 319-321.

Empirical ego. 164-166.

Epicureanism, the theory of, about summum, bonum,

324, 325.

Ether,

7.

Eudaimonia, as the summum bonum,

323, 324

Evolute, as appearing in the process of creation, 172

„ as referred to in the Kāṭha texts, 182.

Evolution, the principle of, in creation, 171-172. 225.

Evolvent, as appearing in the process of creation, 172.

Exegesis, of Hinduism, 101-108.

F

Faith, in the Absolute as intuitive, 45-47,

- „ the force of, 302
 „ as the first of the nine
 stages in Bhakti, 271.
 Fanatic, in Vaiṣṇavism, 253,
 254.
 Flute, the effect of Kṛṣṇa's,
 upon irrational animals
 and plants, 237,
 „ the metaphysical mean-
 ing of Kṛṣṇa's, 115, 116.
 Forbearance, as a moral and
 religious quality, 370.
 „ in the system of Yoga,
 283.
 Freedom of the will, 343.
 Fructescent, as a class of acts,
 9 int.
 Frugality, as a moral quality,
 356, 357.
- G
- Garga-Saṁhitā, on Saṁvit, 2*
 Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavism, the ghos-
 tly shadow of, 5 int;
 „ the meaning of, 230-232;
 „ excellences of 255-259;
 „ summum bonum from
 the standpoint of, 346,
 347;
 „ moral precepts and tea-
 chings contained in, 352-
 363, 370-375.
 Gāṇapatya, 259.
 Gāuḍī, on non-violence,
 Gāthā, 13.
- Gayatrī, as contained in the
 beginning verse of the
 Bhāgavata, 22-23, 37-39;
 „ text cited, 38*.
 Generosity, as a moral quality,
 355, 356.
 Gītā, on Māyā as the potency
 of Bhagavān, 27,
 „ on Bhakti as the only
 means for attaining self-
 realisation, 27, 187,
 „ on the absoluteness of
 Kṛṣṇa, 122-128;
 „ on Jīva Śakti, 159, 163;
 „ on the atheistic charac-
 ter of Śaṅkara's theory
 of illusion, 180, 180*;
 „ on the high potency of
 Bhakti, 187;
 „ on the necessity of in-
 carnation, 245;
 „ on the superiority and
 excellence of the Bhakti
 cult 278-281, 289-291;
 „ on the comparative ex-
 cellences of the three
 cults, 285-287;
 „ on Śaraṇāpatti, 304.
 God, see Brahman and Īśvara
 Gokula, see Vṛndāvana.
 Goloka, as the supersensuous
 residence of Kṛṣṇa, 111-
 112, 143, 248, 249, 255;
 „ the relation of, to Vṛn-

- dāvana, 120, 154, 155.
- „ as referred to in the Śruti texts, 130, 131;
- „ as manifested to Yaśodā by Kṛṣṇa, 144;
- „ as distinct from the universe of beings, 147;
- „ as the supreme residence of Gourāṅga, 231.
- Goodness, a constituent element of Pradhāna or Prakṛti, 35
- Gopa, the metaphysical meaning of, 114;
- „ Kṛṣṇa as, in form and dress, 113-114.
- Gopī, the metaphysical meaning of, 116,
- „ gopīs as the Kāyavyūha of Rādhā, 140 140*.
- „ as the dāsī or kīṅkari of Kṛṣṇa, 308,*
- „ the devotion of, as Rāgātmikā, 314;
- „ the conjugal love of, towards Kṛṣṇa, 318-321.
- Gourāṅga, an historical background to the incarnation of, 229-230;
- „ as the saviour of mankind and the direct revealer of the Bhakti cult, 230-232;
- „ popular misconceptions about, 232-234
- „ as Advaya Jñāna Tatva, 235-242;
- „ as the displayer of blissful potency and mādhubhūya, 232-242;
- „ the philosophic necessity etc. about the incarnation of, 247-249;
- „ relation of the līlā of, to that of Rādhā Kṛṣṇa, 250.
- „ scriptural texts on the theory of, 251-255
- „ excellences of the cult of .. 255-260;
- „ the cult of, as related to the Kṛṣṇa cult, 260;
- „ as Mahāprabhu, 253;
- „ the question of summum bonum with reference to, 346, 347;
- „ the moral teachings and precepts of Lord, 352-363.
- Gourāṅgism, see Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavism
- Govindarāja, on Samvit, 2.*
- Grace, see kindness,
- Green, the self-realisation theory of, 325-327;
- „ the theory as developed in the Vaiṣṇava concept of Premabhakti, 339.
- Grierson, on the conjugal relationship between god and soul, 142*
- Gross, bodies, 165.

- Guṇa, guṇas as the constituent
 elements of Prakṛti, 35,
 138, 172.
 Guṇātīta, as a characteristic of
 Mukti, 336.
 Guru, the necessity of a, 293-
 300;
 ,, the distinctive characte-
 ristics of, 296-299;
 ,, duty towards a 301.
 H
 Happiness, the place of, in the
 concept of summum bo-
 num, 323, 324;
 ,, as primary and secon-
 dary, 350;
 ,, according to the view
 of Charaka, 350*.
 Hanumadbhāṣya, as a com-
 mentary on the Bhāga-
 vata 43.
 Hari, as the Absolute Being
 and identified with Gou-
 rāṅga,
 Harilīlā, as a commentary
 on the Bhāgavata, 43.
 Heaven, description of eter-
 nal, 129;
 ,, see also Vṛndāvana and
 Goloka.
 Hegel, on relation between
 philosophy and religion
 1 int;
- ,, as interpreted different-
 ly, 21;
 ,, the dialectic of, 21;
 ,, on the meaning of 'Per-
 son', 90;
 ,, the objective idealism of,
 152, 217-220.
 Hetu, defined, 6.
 Hlādinī, as one of the three
 parā-śaktis, 54-59, 58*,
 59*, 67, 68-69, 79;
 ,, as a synonym for rasa,
 71;
 ,, as constituting the cons-
 tant divine associates in
 Kṛṣṇa's beatific sports,
 138,
 ,, the highest stage of, 139,
 147.
 ,, gradations in the mani-
 festation of, 141-147;
 ,, līlā as the outcome of,
 153;
 ,, the essence of, as consti-
 tuting Bhakti, 266, 267,
 310.
 Hoffding, on Vedānta, 5 int
 Humanity, the doctrine of
 love and servitude to,
 364-375.
 Hume, on summum bonum,
 325.
 Humility, as a moral and re-
 ligious quality, 353, 354.
 Hūna, 288.

- Hyperconnotation 24, 109.
- Hylozoism, 236.
- Ideal-devotee, see Rādhā.
- Idealism, 152, 217, 218.
- Identity, the logical principle of, 207, 208.
- Ignorance, as the cause of bondage, 8 int
- „ as appearing in Śaṅkara's theory of Māyā, 175-180:
- „ as enveloping Jiva, 208
- „ Brahman as the subject and object, 192.
- Illusion, see Māyā.
- Immanent, Bhagavān as, 32,
- „ Paramātmā as 87-92, 124, 164, 180, 228, 318
- Implicativeness, the same as Lakṣaṇā vṛtti.
- Incarnation, see avatāra
- Incumbent, as a class of acts, 9 int, 269.
- Indra, as the name of Brahman in Śruti, 182;
- „ as the heavenly deity 334.
- Indian philosophy, the fundamental doctrines common to 7-11 int.
- inference, as a source of knowledge, 1-3, 5-7, 7*, 9.
- Injunction, in its bearing upon bhakti, 314-318.
- Injunctory Bhakti, 302-309.
- Intuitive faith, see Absolute.
- Involution, of time, 251.
- Islamic religion, 62-63.
- Itihāsa, as included in Vedas 11.
- Īkṣaṇa, as necessary for creation, 35-36, 35*, 36*, 91, 225.
- Īlā, as an emanation of Mahalakṣmī, 133.
- Īśvara, Paramātmā as, 124;
- „ according to Śaṅkara's theory, 180, 190-195.
- J
- Jagadīśa Bose (Dr.), as an exponent of the doctrine of plant sensibility, 233.
- Jaimini, the religious view of, 17;
- „ on vidhi and arthavādā, 211, 212.
- „ as defining Dharma, 314;
- „ on summum bonum, 329.
- Jaivānanda, 266, 267.
- Jāmāṭṛ Muni, as the most ancient expounder of

- Śrī-Vaiṣṇavism, 160.
- Jijñāsā the meaning of, 24-25.
- Jīva, as Kṣetrajñā, 88-89;
- „ the concept of, explained, 158-166, 161*, 163*;
- „ classification of, 165-166;
- „ standing to Bhagavān or Brahman in the relation of non-identity, 182-191, 281;
- „ as the dāsa of Bhagavān Hari, 191;
- „ according to the Appropriation and Reflexion theories, 192-198;
- „ as identical with Brahman, 201-209;
- „ as deviating from its natural function and in bondage, 261, 282;
- „ the necessity of Bhakti for a, 260-263, 293;
- „ the function of, 265, 293;
- „ the denotation of, 364.
- Jīva-sevā, as the loftiest moral duty, 364-368.
- Jīvanmukta, 279, 280, 281, 282.
- Jñāna, as meaning Dhyāna, upasanā, etc., 24-25;
- „ as constituting the body, senses etc. of the Absolute Being, 50-51;
- „ as explained by Jīva Goswāmī, 52-54;
- „ as meaning Jñānin, 52-53;
- „ as an attribute of Jīva, 160-162;
- „ as innate, 166;
- „ as implicit, 167;
- „ true, as concealed or suppressed by Māyā, 170;
- „ as having a place in the Bhakti cult, 263, 263*;
- „ the essence of, as constituting Bhakti, 266-269;
- „ as relating to Brahman, 273, 277, 281;
- „ according to the Gītā, 281;
- „ Vāsudeva as viśuddha, 296;
- „ relating to the Highest Self as the summum bonum, 322, 330-331.
- Jñāna-Kāṇḍa, 25-26, 275.

Jñāna-mārga,	83;	Kālajavana,	334.
„ antiquity and meaning of,	279;	Kant, on the relation between religion and morality,	347;
„ classification of the followers of,	279, 290;	see also duty.	
„ as inferior to the Bhakti and Yoga mārgas,	281, 282, 285-287.	Kāma, as distinguished from Prema,	141.
Jñāna-miśrā bhakti,	313.	Kāraṇarvāṇyī Saṅkarsana, as a manifestation of Paramātmā,	91.
Kaivalya, as the summum bonum according to Yoga,	83.	Kārpaṇya, as an element of Śaraṇāpatti,	303, 304.
Kalpa, as a portion of the Vedas,	13.	Kāyavyūha,	140-141, 140*
Kauṣa,	246, 247, 258.	Keśava, as a name of Kṛṣṇa,	106, 107.
Kapila, 8: his theory of creation	35-36, 35*, 36*.	Kevalabrahmopāsaka, as one of the two main classes of followers of the Jñāna mārga,	279.
Karmān, doctrine of, 7 int;	66.	Khaṣa,	288.
„ as constituting an element of Nimitta Māyā,	168-169.	Kindness, meaning of,	294:
Karmakāṇḍa,	25-26, 275, 276.	„ causality of, with regard to the first initiation into the Bhakti Cult,	294, 295;
Karma-mārga, basis of,	275;	„ as a moral quality,	352-354.
„ meaning of,	275-277;		
„ inferiority of, to the Bhakti-mārga,	277, 278;		
„ as a stepping stone to the three mārgas,	287.	Kirāta, as welcome to the Bhāgavata Dharma,	288.
Karmapurusa, as explained by Sūśruta,	166.	Kīrtana, defined,	304, 307.
Kartābhajā, 6 int.		Kṛṣṇa, sweetness of the name of,	15-16;
Kaṭu,	311.	„ as the object of meditation for all,	25;
Kāla, as an element of Nimitta Māyā,	168-169.		

- „ as higher than Nārāya-
 ṇa 49;
 „ the concept of, explai-
 ned in detail, 56—
 „ the derivative meaning
 of. 108-109;
 „ as having no swagata
 bheda, 109-110;
 „ as having contradictions
 reconciled in Him,
 . 112-113;
 „ as having a human form
 with distinct complex-
 ion etc., 113-118;
 „ as Vāsudeva, 118-119,
 127-128;
 „ as having a peculiar
 dwelling place 117, 120-
 121;
 „ according to the Gītā
 view, 122-128;
 „ according to Vedic and
 Upanisad texts, 128-134
 „ as related to His beatific
 associates in Achintya
 bhedābheda, 138, 139;
 „ as the concrete Absolute
 Idea. 147-151;
 „ as the best displayer of
 blissful potency, 236,
 237;
 „ the philosophic necessity
 etc. about the incarna-
- tion of, 242-247;
 „ as the āśraya of His
 beatific sports, 248, 255,
 256.
 Kṛṣṇaism, see Kṛṣṇa.
 Kṛṣṇa chaitanya, see Gourāṇ
 ga.
 Kṣapaṇaka, 8.
 Kṣāra, as Pradhāna, 182.
 Kṣāra, as appearing in the
 medical science of the
 Hindus 69-70.
 Ksetra, as body, 88;
 „ as an element of Nimitta
 Māyā, 168, 170.
 Ksetrajña, as qualifying Jiva.
 and Paramātmā, 87-89;
 „ as qualifying Jiva, 166,
 Kṣīrodaśāyī Purusa, as a par-
 tial manifestation of Pa-
 ramātmā, 91, 91*.
 Kumārila, 1.
 Kūrma, as an Incarnate Being,
 100.
 L
 Lakṣaṇā vṛtti, as adopted by
 Śaṅkara, 42, 200-
 202.
 Lavaṇa, as a sensuous rasa in
 the medical science, 311.
 Liberality, as a moral quality,
 355, 356.
 Līṅga, as a technical term in

- Nyāyā, 6.
- „ destruction of līṅga deha 336.
- Līlā, the meaning of, 151-152;
- „ Creation as, 152, 153 153*.
- „ as pertaining to Swayam Bhagavān, 153;
- „ classification of, 154-156;
- „ reconciliation of the two kinds of, 156-157;
- „ as related to Theory. 235*.
- Līlā Śakti, 136; see also Līlā.
- Lock, on summum bonum, 325;
- „ on the relation between religion and morality 347.
- Logos, theory of, 8, 9, 226, 226*.
- Lordliness, of Bhagavān, 61-62, 78-79 113, 133;
- „ as suppressing graceful charm, 112, 153;
- „ as guided by graceful charm, 79, 111-112, 119, 126-128, 139-147, 236.
- Love, as consisting in the highest development of powers, 111.
- „ as supersensuous and sensuous, 139, 342-344;
- „ as devotional, 139-147, 149, 312 3:1, 338-345;
- „ God as, according to the east and west, 142;*
- „ as distinguished psychologically from happiness, 343;
- „ of humanity, 364-368.
- Madhura rasa, as sensuous, 311;
- „ as supersensuous emotional feeling, 313, 319, 320.
- Madhwāchāryya, on the authoritativeness of the Vedas, 10, 11,*
- „ about Śaṅkara, 41*
- „ as a commentator on the Ved. sūtras, 20, 76;
- „ on the concept of Kṛṣṇa, 134;*
- „ on the reality of the world, 219.
- Mahat, as the first evolute of Pradhāna, 35,* 36;*
- „ as secondary causality, 132.
- Mahābhārata, as included in scriptures, 11
- „ on Purāṇas as interpreter of the Vedas, 12, 73
- Mahābhāva, as the highest stage in devotional love 73, 145, 146, 145*, 256

- Mahākāla; as the bodily lustre
 of Kṛṣṇa, 107
 Mahālakṣmī, as the most gene-
 ric antarāṅgā Śakti, 135,
 136;
 „ as identical with Rādhā,
 140.
 Mahāpralaya, 163, 215, 216.
 Mahāvākya, of the Bhāgavata,
 99, 106-107,
 „ of the Upaniṣads, 199,
 199.*
 Mahāviṣṇu, as a manifestation
 of Paramātmā, 91.
 Maheśwara, as implied by the
 Praṇava, 37.
 Manāna, as an element of de-
 votion, 264, 270.
 Manas, as meaning the Highest
 Mind Aniruddha, 218;
 „ as the internal organ;
 360,
 Manu, on the authoritative-
 ness of the Vedas, 10-
 „ on Purāṇas as interpre-
 tor of the Vedas, 12;
 „ as cognisant of all the
 Vedas, 18;
 „ on plant-sensibility, 238;
 „ on formal rites, 289*;
 „ on sevā, 308;
 „ on the highest duty, 350;
 „ on gift-making as a duty,
 356.
 Mantra, as one class of Vedic
 texts, 211.
 Mantropāśanāmayī, as one as-
 pect of non-manifest līlā, 155,
 156.
 Matter, the Platonic view of,
 172;
 „ as constituting the world,
 225; see also Prakṛti.
 Material cause, defined, 10 int;
 „ Pradhāna as, 137, 172;
 „ Brahman as, 209-210.
 Materialism, refuted, 161, 216
 218.
 Mathurā, the metaphysical
 meaning of, 97;
 „ as the supesensuous hea-
 ven for Kṛṣṇa's beatific
 sports, 111-112, 154;
 „ residence, in 271, 272.
 Matsya, see avatāra.
 Martineau, on the relation be-
 tween religion and morality,
 347.
 Mathew Arnold, on the rela-
 tion between religion and mo-
 rality, 347.
 Mādana, as an aspect of Mahā-
 bhāva, 145, 146.
 Mādhava, as occurring in the

- Rk. Parisista śruti, 131-132, 146, 147.
- Mādhavāchāryya, 202
- Mādhuryya, as the essence and differentia of Bhagvattā, 68:
- „ as prevailing in the heaven-trio, 111-112;
- „ as clearly explained by Vidyābhūṣaṇa, 133;
- „ as displayed by Kṛṣṇa and Govindā, 239-242;
- see also Rāga and Love
- Māyā, as related to the Absolute Being, 27, 65, 66, 124, 127, 154 158-162, 163, 166-67,
- „ the doctrine of, explained and discussed, 167-182;
- „ according to the V. Theory, 167-173, 209, 216, 224 2 5
- „ according to the school of Śaṅkara, 174-180, 192-195;
- „ according to various scriptural texts, 181 182.
- Māyin, 181,
- Mc. Teggart, 21.
- Metempsychosis, see Transmigration of Soul.
- Mill, on summum bonum, 325.
- Mīmāṃsā, on pramāṇa, 1;
- „ the religious view of, 17;
- „ Pūrva and Uttara, 25-26;
- „ on summum bonum, 329
- See also Jaimini.
- Mohana, as an aspect of Mahābhāva, 145, 146.
- Moksāksāṅksi, as one class of followers of the Jñāna mārga, 279.
- Moral qualities, a short account of, 352-363.
- Morality, as closely related to religion, 347-352.
- Monism, 139.
- Muktāphala, as a commentary on the Bhāgavata, 43.
- Muktapragrahā, See, hyper connotation.
- Mukti, as the summum bonum according to Rānānujā and Madhwāchāryya, 321-;
- „ as the summum bonum according to the School of Śaṅkara, 330-332;
- „ as defined in the V. System, 330, 333-336;
- „ five kinds of, 335, 336,
- „ characteristics of, 336; 337;
- „ as developed into Prema Lhakti, 337-340

- „ as related to Bhakti, 341,
342.
- Mumukṣu, as a sub-class under
Moksākaṅkṣmī, 279.
- Murati, see Flute.
- N
- Navadvīpa as the place for
Gourāṅga's manifest līlā,
229, 230.
- Nanda, as the acknowledged
father of Kṛṣṇa, 119,
128, 235.
- „ the metaphysical mean-
ing of, 119
- Narottama Thākura, as the au-
thor of Premabhakti-
chandrīkā, 301, 302.
- Nārāyaṇa, as the Lord of Para-
vīra, Benedictory
verse ;
„ as Śeṣa, 33.
„ as the Person—the Abso-
lute Lord, 33, 34, 129
„ as lower than Kṛṣṇa, 112,
121, 125, 126, 129, 130,
„ as a commentator on the
Atharv Up., 130
- Neoplatonism, 72-73,
- Nescience, see Māyā and Igno-
rance.
- Nididhyāsana, as an element
of devotion, 264, 270,
- Nigamaṇa, as one of the five
members in a Hindu
Syllogism, 6.
- Nimvārka, 20.
- Nirāṅjana, 331.
- Nirvāṇa, as the summum bo-
num according to Bud-
dhism, 328.
- Niṣṭhā, as one of the nine
stages of Bhakti, 271,
272.
- Nivṛttilakṣaṇa, see Dharma
- Non-violence, the principle
of, 369-375.
- Nyāya, on pīṇāṇa, 1;
„ on summum bonum, 328.
- O
- Obligatory, as a class of acts,
9 int.,
- Occasional, as a class of acts,
9 int., 269.
- Onkāra, 199 *; see also Gāya-
trī.
- P
- Pakṣa, as appearing in a Hin-
du Syllogism, 6.
- Pancharātra, as included in
scriptures, 11.
- Parabrahman, as distinguished
from Brahman, 60;
„ as applying to Kṛṣṇa,
62, 113;
„ as applying to Viṣṇu,
110.

- Paramahamsapriyā, 43.
 Paramātmā, the concept of,
 explained, 87-92;
 „ as having threefold ma-
 nifestation, 91, 91*;
 „ as related, to Bhagavān
 and Brahman, 92-93;
 „ as the direct displayer
 of the Vahiraṅgā Śakti,
 98-99, 124, 153, 159,
 164, 228;
 „ as the object of worship
 according to Yoga mā-
 rga, 283, 284, 329, 330.
 Paravyoman, Benedictory
 verse, 132.
 Parā Śakti, as classified, 54,
 55.
 „ explanation and grada-
 tion of, 56-59, 64-69,
 108, 135-137, 146, 147;
 „ divinities of, 137-146.
 Paribhāṣā, 101-104.
 Paripāna Vāda, as a theory
 of creation, 209-213.
 Parokṣa Vāda, as a class of
 Scriptural texts, 275,
 276.
 Patāñjali, 10;
 „ on Yoga, 282;
 „ on the meaning of dhy-
 āna 306*;
 „ on summum bonum, 329,
 330.
 Pathology, 261.
 Pāda, 107, 188, 307.
 Pāda-Sevana, as an element
 of Injunctory Bhakti,
 307.
 Pascala 46,
 Passion, as a constituent ele-
 ment of Prakṛti, 35,
 35*.
 „ as a mental phenome-
 non, see Love.
 Passion-control, as a moral
 quality, 360-363.
 Perception, as a source of
 knowledge, 1-5;
 „ the relative authorita-
 tiveness of, 9.
 Perfection theory, see Green.
 Philosophy of Religion, 1-3 int.
 Philosophy of V. Religion, 3-7
 int.
 Plato, on matter, 172;
 „ on summum bonum 323.
 Prabhākara, 1.
 Pradhāna, as the material
 cause of creation, 35,
 36, 35*, 36*, 163, 168-
 173, 181, 182, 225.
 Prakaraṇa sthāna, 101, 102.
 Prakṛtalilā, 154-157, 334.
 Prakṛti, see Pradhāna.
 Parmā, meaning of, 1.

Pramāṇa, defined,	1;	„ as the summum bonum
„ kinds of,	1-7;	according to Bengal Vai-
„ Vedas as,	7-19;	snavism, Benedictory
„ Bhāgavata as,	20-30.	Verse, 11int., 145, 249,
Pranava, 37, 38*, 129, 199*.		258, 271, 321, 321*,
Pratijñā, as one of the five me-		„ as a stage of Bhakti as
mbers in a Hindu syllo-		explained by Valadeva
gism,	6.	Vidyābhūṣaṇa, 265-267;
Pratimā,	85 86.	„ with reference to Gou-
Prativimba-Vāda as a theory		rāṅga, 346, 347.
on the relation between		Prāmaṇyavivarta, 257.
god and soul, 195-198.		Premānanda, 26, 136, 190,
Pratyakṣa, see Perception.		273; see also Prema.
Pravṛttilakṣaṇa, see Dharma.		Prīti, as appearing in the con-
Prayojana, 11 int.		cept of Prīti-bhakti, 340-
Prākṛta-śaṅkāra, as empiri-		342;
cal ego,	163-165.	„ meaning and gradation
Prāṇa, as the vital principle		of, 342-347.
of an organic body, 169;		Pseudo-Vaiṣṇavism, 5 int.
see also Apologetic.		Purāṇa, eternity of, 7-9;
Prāptabrahmalaya, as a sub-		„ relation of, to Vedas,
class of followers of the		11-18;
jñāna-mārga,	279.	„ classification of, 19;
Prāptaswarūpa, as a sub class		„ authoritativeness of 7-19.
of followers of the jñāna-		Purusa, as human personality
mārga,	279.	according to the view of
Prāptasiddhi, as a class of Yo-		Charaka, 137, 137*; see
gis,	284.	also Paramātmā.
Prārabdha, as a class of acts,		Purusottama. Bhagavān as,
9 int.,	292.	90.
Prema, as distinguished from		Pūrva Mimāṃsā, see Jaimini.
Kāma,	140;	Pūtanā, 111, 316

- Q**
- Quiescent State, 282, 283 333.
- R**
- Raghuṇandana, as a law-giver, 187.
- Rasa, as applied to the Absolute, 57, 85, 85*,
- „ the meaning of, from three points of view, 69-74, 65*, 71*;
- „ according to the theory of the Hindu medical science, 311, 312,
- „ classification of, in V. Theology 312-314.
- Rasaghana, 71.
- Rasika, the Absolute as, 71-72;
- Rādhā, the principle of, 135-147;
- „ as the Divinity in whom there is the complete sublimation of lordship 139
- „ as identical with Mahā-lakṣmī, 139-140.
- „ as standing to Kṛṣṇa in Achintyabhedābheda, 140;
- „ as representing the highest stage of devotional ecstasy, 143-146, 145*.
- 373;
- „ the concept of, as tacitly referred to in the Bhāgavata, 148, 149;
- „ as directly stated in the Vṛhat Goutamiya and Ādipurāṇa, 148, 149.
- „ as the visaya of Kṛṣṇa-sports, 247, 248, 250, 256.
- Rādhakṛṣṇa, the concept of, 147-151.
- Rāga, 310-314.
- Rāgānugā, as a stage of Bhakti, 289, 309-321.
- Rā-ātmikā, a stage of Bhakti, characterising the constant divine associates of Bhagavan, 310, 313, 314.
- Rājasa Kalpa, 19.
- Rāma, as an incarnation of the Absolute, 237.
- Rāmānanda, as an adherent of Lord Gourāṅga, 257.
- Rāmānuja on the authoritativeness of the Vedas, 10;
- „ about the meaning of 'knowledge' in the Brahmasūtras, 24-25;
- „ as interpreter of the fifth Ved. sūtra, 25-26;
- „ as expounder of the Viśiṣṭādvaitavāda, 126;
- „ on plurality of Jīvas, 165;
- „ on the relation between the Absolute and soul, 184-186

- „ on the meaning of the text "That thou art", 202-205, 331,*
- „ on the theory of creation, 221, 222;
- „ on the meaning of Dh-yāna and Dhruvā Smṛti, 306,*
- „ on Mukti as the summum bonum, 321.*
- Reality, see world.
- Relativity, see Absolute.
- Release, see Mukti.
- Religion, the meaning of, 1-3 int;
- „ the highest secret of, according to the Gītā, 123-126;
- „ as the basis of and the surest guarantee for morality, 347-352;
- Remembrance, as a stage of Injunctory Bhakti, 305, 306, 306,*
- Revelation. as general and particular, 2 int;
- „ as the authority according to western systems, 40.
- Revenge, noble and ignoble, 355.
- Right apprehension, 10 int.
- Ruchi, as one of the nine stages of Bhakti, 271.
- Rūpa, 52.
- Rk., 11;
- „ on the concept of Kṛṣṇa, 130-131;
- „ about Goloka, 131;
- „ the Pariśiṣṭa Śākhā of, on the concept of Rājha-Kṛṣṇa, 131-132.
- R̥tvik, 13.
- S
- Śabda, as a source of knowledge, being identified with Revelation, 1-4, 7, 35.
- Śabdabrahman. as a partial aspect of Brahman and the source of all words and ideas, 8-9, 156, 226.
- Sacchidānanda, as a name of the Absolute Being. 27, 54, 133.
- Sadasadātmaka, Prakṛti, 172.
- Sadāchāra, 288, 289.
- Sadghana, 50.
- Sahajiyā, 6.
- Sahasraśīrṣā Virāt, as a manifestation of Paramātmā, 91.
- Saint, definition and classification of, 296-299.
- Sakhya, as a stage of divine love 142, 308, 312 313,
- Salvation, see Emancipation,

Mukti and Prema.

- Śama, 312.
 Samavāya, as a kind of relation 70.
 Samavāyin, as a kind of causality, 70.
 Samaṣṭi jivāntaryāmin, as a manifestation of Paramātmā, 91.
 Samākhyā, 101, 102.
 Samādhi, as an element of Injunctory Bhakti, 306;
 „ as the last stage in Yoga, 285.
 Sambandha, 11 int.
 Saubhava, as a pramāṇa, 1-2.
 Śaṅkara, the school of, on pramāṇa, 2;
 „ about the authoritative-ness of the Vedas, 10;
 „ as an advocate of the Bhakti cult, 41-43;
 „ as a monistic philosopher, 49;
 „ the school of, on God's dwelling place, 75-76;
 „ as an expounder of the Vedānta, 20-21, 81;
 „ as an upholder of the exegesis of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism 101;
 „ on the theory of Māyā, 173-181;

- „ on the relation between the Absolute and Soul, 199-202;
 „ as an adverse critic 259.
 Saṁvit, as a source of knowledge, 2*
 „ as one of the parā Śaktis, 54-59, 67-68, 138, 266, 267.
 Saṁvyoman, 132.
 Saṁdhi, see Saṁvit.
 Śaraṇapatti, as an element of Injunctory Bhakti, 303, 304.
 Sat, as meaning 'being' or 'reality', 175, 214-216.
 Sattva guṇa, as a constituent element of Prakṛti, 35, 35*.
 Satya, the meaning of, 26-27, 96-97.
 Sādhaka, as a class of followers of the Jñāna mārga, 279.
 Sādhana bhakti, see, Injunctory and Rāgānugā.
 Sādhusaṅga, as one of the nine elements of Bhakti, 271.
 Sādhya, as a Naiyāyika term, 6.
 Sālokya, as a kind of mukti, 335.
 Sāman, 11.
 Sāṁpiya, as a kind of mukti, 335.

- Sāṃkhya-kārikā, 5.
 Sāṃkhya-System, on pramāṇa, 1;
 „ on summum bonum, see also Kapila.
 Śānta bhakti, 284, 313
 Śāstī, as a kind of mukti; 335.
 Sārūpya, as a kind of mukti, 335.
 Śāstra, 11, 11*,
 Sāttvika kalpa, 19.
 Sāyujya, as a kind of mukti, 190, 335, 336,
 Scepticism, 103.
 Scripture, 11, 11*.
 Self, see Soul
 Self-realisation, as an ethical theory, 325-327.
 see also Mukti and Prema.
 Self-revelation, 2*.
 Sense-control, as a moral quality, 360-363.
 Servitude, See Sevā
 Sevā, 11 int., 150;
 „ as the summum bonum when directed to Bhagavān, 307, 308, 338-340;
 „ as understood with reference to worldly affairs, 308.
 Sidgwick, as a moralist, 322, 325
- Śiśupāla, as a 111, 258, 317, 318.
 Śiva, 41-42.
 Smaraṇa, see Remembrance.
 Smṛti, see Manu and Raghunandana,
 Soul, see Transmigration and Jiva.
 Spencer, Herbert, on the problem of the Absolute, 45-46, 299.
 Spirit, as constituting the actual world, 225;
 „ the same as Brahman, 196.
 Spiritual guide, 299-302.
 Sport, see Līlā.
 Spinoza, on the theory of creation, 221.
 Śravaṇa, as an element of devotion, 264, 270.
 Śraddhā, as the first stage of devotion, 271.
 Śrīdāma, 142.
 Śrī sect, 126, 159.
 Śruti, see Veda.
 Stoic, view of summum bonum, 324.
 Suddha sattva as the name of pure chit, 138*.
 Suggestio falsi, 359, 360.
 Śukahṛdaya, as a commentary on the Bhāgavata, 43.

Summum bonum, the attainment of, as open to all, 15, 111;	Swārasikī, as an aspect of non-manifest līlā 154.
„ the nature of, as determined by the highest object of desire, 190,	155.
„ different theories about 321-330;	Syllogism, Hindu, 5-7,
„ according to the School of Śāṅkara, 330-332;	Synthesis, 103, 105, 108 115,
„ according to the V. System, 320-347;	116.
„ the culminating point of, 130.	Synthetic, logical propositions as, 207.
Suppresio veri, 359-360.	Syntheticism, Vaiṣṇavism as spiritual, 115-116.
Suśrūta Saṃhitā, on the eternity of Jīva, 166.	Tamas, see Darkness.
Sūtra, defined, 20, 20.	Taṅka, 20.
Suvala, 142.	Tantra Śāstra, 2.
Swabhāva, as an element of Nimitta Māyā, 168 169.	Tatastha lakṣaṇa, the meaning of, 28.
Swagatabheda, 49.	Tatastha Śakti, see Jīva.
Swajñātīya bheda, 49.	Tattwadīpikā, as a commentary on the Bhāṅgavata, 43.
Swarāt, as qualifying the Absolute, 23, 38	Tāmasa kalpa, 19.
Swarūpa lakṣaṇa, the meaning of, 28.	Tennyson, 338.
Swarūpānuvādhitva, 166.	That thou art, the full meaning of, 198-209.
Swayambhagavān, as distinguished from Bhagavān, 24, 79, 80.	Tikta, 311.
Swayamsiddha, the meaning of, 48.	Tolstoi, on servitude to Humanity, 366, 367;
	„ on non-violence, 371-373
	Tranquility, see Quiescent state.
	Transcendental, Bhagavān as, 24, 29, 30.
	Transmigration, the doctrine of, of soul, 7-10 int., 63.

U

- Udāharāṇa, as one of the five
 members in a Hindu
 Syllogism, 6.
 Udgātā, 13.
 Ulukya, 10.
 Upakrama, 123, 263.
 Upalakṣaṇa, 33, 202.
 Upamā, as a parāmāṇa, 1.
 Upanayā, as one of the five
 members in a Hindu
 Syllogism, 6.
 Upasamhāra, 123, 263.
 Upādāna Māyā, see Māyā.
 Upākhyāna, as a portion of
 the Vedas, 13.
 Upendra, 37.
 V
 Vahiraṅgā Śakti, see Māyā.
 Vaikunṭha, as the residence
 of Kṛṣṇa as Nārāyaṇa,
 112, 129, 130.
 Vaiśeṣika, on pramāṇa, 1: 212;
 ,, on summum bonum, 328.
 Vaiṣṇava religion, philosophy
 of, 3-7 int.
 Vaiṣṇava theology, the lofty
 character of, 5 int.
 Valadeva, 106.
 Valadeva Vidyābhāṣaṇa, on the
 authoritativeness of the
 Vedas, 10,
 ,, as a commentator on the
 Vedānta, 20, 43,

- ,, as an expounder of the
 Bhāg. cult, 43;
 ,, on the absoluteness of
 Kṛṣṇa, 132-134;
 ,, on the relation between
 Brahman and Jiva, 184-
 186;
 on the reality of the
 world, 213.
 ,, on the theory of crea-
 tion, 222, 223;*
 ,, on the concept of Gour-
 āṅga, 253.
 ,, on the concept of Prema
 Bhakti, 266-267.
 Vandana, as an element of
 Injunctory Bhakti, 303,
 307.
 Varāha, see Avatāra.
 Varuṇa, as teaching Brahman
 jñāna, 29.
 Vasudeva, the metaphysical
 meaning of, 118.
 Vāchaspatimiśra, on Vyāpti-
 jñāna, 5.
 Vādarāyaṇa, see Veda Vyāsa.
 Vāsana bhāṣya, 43.
 Vāsudeva, as qualifying Kṛṣ-
 ṇa, 88, 118, 120, 127, 128.
 Vātsalya, 142, 143,
 Vātsāyana bhāṣya, as defining
 Pramāṇa 1.
 Vāula, 6 int.
 Vāyu, as defined in Hindu